arXiv:1512.08872v1 [math.OC] 30 Dec 2015

QSDPNAL: A two-phase proximal augmented Lagrangian method for convex quadratic semidefinite programming

Xudong Li*, Defeng Sun† and Kim-Chuan Toh‡

December 28, 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we present a two-phase proximal augmented Lagrangian method, called QSDPNAL, for solving convex quadratic semidefinite programming (QSDP) problems with constraints consisting of a large number of linear equality, inequality constraints, a simple convex polyhedral set constraint, and a positive semidefinite cone constraint. As the cornerstone of QSDPNAL, we first introduce the powerful and elegant inexact symmetric Gauss-Seidel (sGS) decomposition technique for solving a convex minimization problem whose objective is the sum of a multi-block quadratic function and a non-smooth function involving only the first block. Then, a first order algorithm which relies on our inexact sGS decomposition technique is developed in QSDPNAL-Phase I with the aim of solving a QSDP problem to moderate accuracy or using it to generate a reasonably good initial point. In QSDPNAL-Phase II, we design a proximal augmented Lagrangian method (ALM) where the inner subproblem in each iteration is solved via the inexact accelerated block coordinate descent (ABCD) method [arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.04278, (2015)], which again relies on our inexact sGS decomposition technique, together with the novel incorporation of the semismooth Newton-CG algorithm. Moreover, under suitable conditions, we are able to analyze the rate of convergence of the proposed algorithm. In the implementation of QSDPNAL, we also develop special techniques for solving large scale linear systems of equations under certain subspace constraints. More specifically, simpler and yet better conditioned linear systems are carefully designed to replace the original linear systems and innovative shadow sequences are constructed to alleviate the numerical difficulties brought about by the crucial subspace constraints. Extensive numerical results for various large scale QSDPs show that our two-phase framework is not only fast but also robust in obtaining accurate solutions.

Keywords: Convex quadratic semidefinite programming, symmetric Gauss-Seidel, augmented Lagrangian, semismooth Newton-CG method

AMS subject classifications: 90C06, 90C20, 90C22, 90C25, 65F10

*Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, 10 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Singapore (matlixu@nus.edu.sg).

†Department of Mathematics and Risk Management Institute, National University of Singapore, 10 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Singapore (matsundf@nus.edu.sg). This research is supported in part by the Ministry of Education, Singapore, Academic Research Fund under Grant R-146-000-194-112.

‡Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, 10 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Singapore (mattohkc@nus.edu.sg). This research is supported in part by the Ministry of Education, Singapore, Academic Research Fund under Grant R-146-000-194-112.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{S}^n_+$ be the cone of positive semidefinite matrices in the space of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices $\mathcal{S}^n$ endowed with the standard trace inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the Frobenius norm $\| \cdot \|$.

Consider the convex quadratic semidefinite programming (QSDP) problem in the following standard form:

$$(\mathbf{P}) \quad \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\langle X,\, \mathcal{Q}X \rangle + \langle C,\, X \rangle \mid \mathcal{A}X = b,\; X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+,\; X \in \mathcal{K} \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{S}^n \to \mathcal{S}^n$ is a self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator, $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{S}^n \to \Re^m$ is a linear map whose adjoint is denoted as $\mathcal{A}^*$, $C \in \mathcal{S}^n$, $b \in \Re^m$ are given data, $\mathcal{K}$ is a simple nonempty closed convex polyhedral set in $\mathcal{S}^n$, e.g., $\mathcal{K} = \{X \in \mathcal{S}^n \mid L \le X \le U\}$ with $L, U \in \mathcal{S}^n$ being given matrices. The main objective of this paper is to design and analyse efficient algorithms for solving $(\mathbf{P})$ and its dual. We are particularly interested in the case where the dimensions n and/or m are large, and the matrix representation of $\mathcal{Q}$ may not be explicitly stored or computed. For example, if $\mathcal{Q} = H \otimes H$ is the Kronecker product of a dense symmetric positive semidefinite matrix $H \in \mathcal{S}^n$ with itself, then it would be extremely expensive to store the matrix representation of $\mathcal{Q}$ explicitly when n is larger than, say, 500. As far as we are aware of, the best solvers currently available for solving $(\mathbf{P})$ are based on inexact primal-dual interior-point methods [31]. However, they are highly inefficient for solving large scale problems as interior-point methods have severe inherent ill-conditioning limitations which would make the convergence of a Krylov subspace iterative solver employed to compute the search directions to be extremely slow. On the other hand, an interior-point method which employs a direct solver to compute the search directions is prohibitively expensive for solving $(\mathbf{P})$ since the cost is at least $O((m + n^2)^3)$ arithmetic operations per iteration. Thus, there is currently no efficient solver for solving the general QSDP problem $(\mathbf{P})$ and this provides the main motivation for writing this paper.

The algorithms which we will design later are based on the augmented Lagrangian function for the dual of $(\mathbf{P})$, which takes the form of

$$(\mathbf{D}) \quad \max \left\{ -\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}}(-Z) - \frac{1}{2}\langle W,\, \mathcal{Q}W \rangle + \langle b,\, y \rangle \mid Z - \mathcal{Q}W + S + A^*y = C,\; S \in \mathcal{S}^n_+,\; W \in \mathcal{W} \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ is any subspace of $\mathcal{S}^n$ containing the range space of $\mathcal{Q}$, Range$(\mathcal{Q})$, $\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot)$ is the support function of $\mathcal{K}$. In this paper, we fix $\mathcal{W} =$ Range$(\mathcal{Q})$, and we will see in the subsequent analysis that this choice in fact plays an important role in making our designed algorithms efficient. Let $\sigma > 0$ be a given positive number. The augmented Lagrangian function for $(\mathbf{D})$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\sigma(Z, W, S, y; X) = \delta^*_{\mathcal{K}}(-Z) + \frac{1}{2}\langle W,\, \mathcal{Q}W \rangle + \delta_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(S) - \langle b,\, y \rangle \\ + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|Z - \mathcal{Q}W + S + \mathcal{A}^*y - C + \sigma^{-1}X\|^2 - \frac{1}{2\sigma}\|X\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

for $(Z, W, S, y, X) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times$ Range$(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \times \Re^n$.

Due to its possible wide applications and mathematical elegance [1, 7, 11, 20], QSDP has been studied quite actively both from the theoretical and numerical aspects. For the recent theoretical developments, one may refer to [6, 19, 29] and references therein. Here we focus on the numerical aspect and we will next briefly review some of the methods available for solving QSDP problems.

Toh et al [30] and Toh [31] proposed inexact primal-dual path-following interior-point methods to solve the special class of convex QSDP without the constraint in $\mathcal{K}$. In theory, these methods can be used to solve QSDP problems with inequality constraints and constraint in $\mathcal{K}$ by reformulating the problems in the required standard form. However, as already mentioned, in practice interior-point methods are not efficient for solving QSDP problems beyond moderate scale either due to the extremely high computational cost per iteration or the inherent ill-conditioning of the linear systems governing the search directions. In [34], Zhao designed a semismooth Newton-CG augmented Lagrangian (NAL) method and analyzed its convergence for solving the primal QSDP problem (**P**). However, the NAL algorithm often encounters numerical difficulty (due to singular or nearly singular generalized Hessian) when the polyhedral set constraint $X \in \mathcal{K}$ is present. Subsequently, Jiang et al [9] proposed an inexact accelerated proximal gradient method for least squares semidefinite programming with neither inequality constraints nor polyhedral set constraint, and the objective function in (**P**) is expressed explicitly in the form of $\|\mathcal{B}X - d\|^2$ for some given linear map $\mathcal{B}$.

More recently, inspired by the successes achieved in [26, 33] for solving the linear SDP problems with nonnegative constraints, Li, Sun and Toh [14] proposed a first-order algorithm, known as the Schur complement based semi-proximal alternating direction method of multipliers (SCB-sPADMM), for solving the dual form (**D**) of QSDP. As far as we aware of, [14] is the first paper to advocate using the dual approach for solving QSDP problems. By leveraging on the inexact block symmetric Gauss-Seidel (sGS) decomposition technique to be presented later in Section 2, Chen, Sun and Toh [4] also employed the dual approach by proposing an efficient inexact ADMM-type first-oder method (which we name as sGS-isPADMM) for solving problem (**D**). Although the dual approach has demonstrated to be highly efficient in obtaining an approximate solution with lower to medium accuracy [14, 4], the design of algorithms aiming to solve (**D**) to high accuracy by incorporating second-order information is still a challenging task.

In this paper, which is motivated by the recent progress made in [26, 33], we aim to provide a thorough study on the design of an algorithm which employs second-order information to solve QSDP problems to high accuracy. We achieve our goal by proposing a two-phase augmented Lagrangian based algorithm with Phase I to generate a reasonably good initial point to warm-start the Phase II algorithm so as to obtain accurate solutions efficiently. We call this new method QSDPNAL since it extends the ideas of SDPNAL [35] and SDPNAL+ [33] for linear SDP problems to QSDP problems. The algorithm which we will adopt in QSDPNAL-Phase I is a variant of the sGS-isPADMM algorithm developed in [4]. The latter algorithm designed for the dual QSDP problem (**D**), and the inexact accelerated block coordinate descent (ABCD) method [27] designed for least squares semidefinite programming problems, are both based on the powerful and elegant inexact sGS decomposition technique to be presented in Section 2. Both algorithms have demonstrated to be highly efficient for computing a low to medium accuracy solution for the underlying QSDP problem. We should emphasize that besides our contributions in designing highly efficient algorithms for solving (**D**), our another piece of important contribution in this paper is the powerful inexact sGS decomposition technique developed in Section 2, which is designed to provide an elegant reformulation of the decomposition technique developed in [14].

In QSDPNAL-Phase II, we design a proximal augmented Lagrangian method (ALM) for solving (**D**) where the inner subproblem in each iteration is solved via the ABCD method together with the intelligent incorporation of the semismooth Newton-CG algorithm. Given $\sigma_0 > 0$, $(Z^0, W^0, S^0, y^0, X^0) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \times \Re^n$, the $(k+1)$th iteration of the proximal ALM

consists of the following steps:

$$(Z^{k+1}, W^{k+1}, S^{k+1}, y^{k+1}) \approx \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Psi_k(Z,W,S,y) := \mathcal{L}_{\sigma_k}(Z,W,S,y;X^k) \\ +\frac{1}{2\sigma}\big(\|Z-Z^k\|^2 + \|W-W^k\|_{\mathcal{Q}}^2 + \|S-S^k\|^2 \\ +\|y-y^k\|^2\big) \mid (Z,W,S,y) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \end{array} \right\},$$

$$X^{k+1} = X^k + \sigma_k(Z^{k+1} - \mathcal{Q}W^{k+1} + S^{k+1} + \mathcal{A}^* y^{k+1} - C), \tag{2}$$

where $\sigma_k \in (0, +\infty)$. By restricting $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$, we are able to design checkable stopping criterion for solving the inner subproblem inexactly while establishing the global convergence of the above proximal augmented Lagrangian method, as well as analyzing its convergence rate. Meanwhile, under this restriction, the difficulties in analyzing the convergence of the ABCD algorithm in [27] and the suplinear (quadratic) convergence of the Newton-CG algorithm are also circumvented. However, at first glance, the restriction that $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ appears to introduce severe numerical difficulties when we solve linear systems under this restriction. Fortunately, by carefully examining our algorithm and performing "smart" numerical linear algebra, we are able to provide techniques in Section 6 to overcome these difficulties. Our preliminary evaluation of QSDPNAL has demonstrated that our algorithm is capable of solving large scale general QSDP problems of the form (**P**) to high accuracy very efficiently. For example, we are able to solve an elementwise weighted nearest correlation matrix estimation problem with matrix dimension $n = 10,000$ and having 50 millions lower bound constraints in about 65 hours to the relative accuracy of less than 10^{-6} in the KKT residual.

The remaining parts of this paper are organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce our inexact block symmetric Gauss-Seidel decomposition technique. We should emphasize here that the sGS technique plays a pivotal role in the design of both two phases of our algorithm. In Section 3, we propose an inexact proximal augmented Lagrangian (ipALM) algorithm which will be used as a prototype for our algorithmic design and study its convergence results. In Section 4, we propose to solve the inner minimization subproblems of the ipALM method by wisely combining the sGS decomposition technique and the semismooth Newton-CG algorithm with the recent developed ABCD algorithm in [27]. Section 5 is devoted to our main algorithm QSDPNAL, which is a two-phase augmented Lagrangian algorithm whose Phase I is used to generate a reasonably good initial point to warm-start the Phase II algorithm so as to obtain accurate solutions efficiently. In Section 6, we discuss issues concerning the efficient implementation of QSDPNAL. In section 7, we discuss the special case of applying QSDPNAL for solving semidefinite matrix least squares problems. In Section 8, we conduct numerical experiments to evaluate the performance of QSDPNAL in solving various convex quadratic semidefinite programming problems and their extensions. We conclude our paper in the final section.

For a given closed proper convex function $\theta : \mathcal{X} \to (-\infty, \infty]$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is a finite-dimensional real inner product space, the proximal mapping $\mathrm{Prox}_\theta(x)$ for θ at a point x is defined by

$$\mathrm{Prox}_\theta(x) = \operatorname*{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \Big\{ \theta(y) + \frac{1}{2}\|y - x\|^2 \Big\}.$$

Throughout this paper, we will often make use of the following identity:

$$\mathrm{Prox}_{t\theta}(x) + t\mathrm{Prox}_{\theta^*/t}(x/t) = x,$$

where $t > 0$ is a given parameter, and $\theta^* : \mathcal{X} \to (-\infty, \infty]$ is the conjugate function of θ.

2 An inexact block symmetric Gauss-Seidel iteration

Here we introduce the powerful and elegant inexact symmetric Gauss-Seidel (sGS) decomposition technique for solving a convex minimization problem whose objective is the sum of a multi-block quadratic function and a non-smooth function involving only the first block. This decomposition technique will be the foundation for us to design our algorithm QSDPNAL.

Let $s \geq 2$ be a given integer and $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{X}_s$, where $\mathcal{X}_i$ are real finite dimensional Euclidean spaces. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we write $x \equiv (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_s) \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, s$. Let $\mathcal{H} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ be a given self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator. Consider the following block decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$

$$\mathcal{H}x \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11} & \mathcal{H}_{12} & \cdots & \mathcal{H}_{1s} \\ \mathcal{H}_{12}^* & \mathcal{H}_{22} & \cdots & \mathcal{H}_{2s} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{H}_{1s}^* & \mathcal{H}_{2s}^* & \cdots & \mathcal{H}_{ss} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_s \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{ii} : \mathcal{X}_i \to \mathcal{X}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, s$ are self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operators, $\mathcal{H}_{ij} : \mathcal{X}_j \to \mathcal{X}_i$ $i = 1, \ldots, s-1$, $j > i$ are linear maps and each $\mathcal{H}_{ij}^* : \mathcal{X}_i \to \mathcal{X}_j$ denotes the adjoint of $\mathcal{H}_{ij}$. Here, we further assume that $\mathcal{H}_{ii} \succ 0$, $\forall\, i = 1, \ldots, s$. Define linear operators $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ by

$$\mathcal{U} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{H}_{12} & \cdots & \mathcal{H}_{1s} \\ & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots \\ & & \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{H}_{(s-1)s} \\ & & & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D} := \mathrm{Diag}(\mathcal{H}_{11}, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_{ss}).$$

Note that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U} + \mathcal{U}^*$ and $\mathcal{D} \succ 0$. For later purpose, we define

$$x_{\leq i} := (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_i), \quad x_{\geq i} := (x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_s), \quad i = 0, \ldots, s+1$$

with the convention that $x_{\leq 0} = x_{\geq s+1} = \emptyset$. We also define the self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator $\mathcal{O} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ by

$$\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{U}\mathcal{D}^{-1}\mathcal{U}^*. \tag{3}$$

Given $r \equiv (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_s) \in \mathcal{X}$, define the convex quadratic function $h : \mathcal{X} \to \Re$ by

$$h(x) := \frac{1}{2}\langle x,\, \mathcal{H}x\rangle - \langle r,\, x\rangle, \quad \forall\, x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Let $\phi : \mathcal{X}_1 \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ be a given closed proper convex function. Suppose $\delta', \delta \in \mathcal{X}$ are given error tolerance vectors with $\delta_1' = \delta_1$. Denote

$$\Delta(\delta', \delta) := \delta + \mathcal{U}\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\delta - \delta'). \tag{4}$$

Given $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, we consider solving the following problem

$$x^+ := \mathrm{argmin}_x \left\{ \phi(x_1) + h(x) + \frac{1}{2}\|x - \bar{x}\|_{\mathcal{O}}^2 - \langle x,\, \Delta(\delta', \delta)\rangle \right\}. \tag{5}$$

The following theorem shows that x^+ can be computed in a block symmetric Gauss-Seidel fashion, and it is the key ingredient for our subsequent algorithmic developments.

Theorem 2.1 (sGS Decomposition)**.** *Assume that the self-adjoint linear operators $\mathcal{H}_{ii}$ are positive definite for all $i = 1, \ldots, s$. Then, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{O} = (\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U})\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U}^*) \succ 0. \tag{6}$$

For $i = s, \ldots, 2$, suppose we have computed $x_i' \in \mathcal{X}_i$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x_i' & := & \mathrm{argmin}_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i} \ \phi(\bar{x}_1) + h(\bar{x}_{\le i-1}, x_i, x'_{\ge i+1}) - \langle \delta_i', \, x_i \rangle \\ & = & \mathcal{H}_{ii}^{-1}\big(r_i + \delta_i' - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{H}_{ji}^* \bar{x}_j - \sum_{j=i+1}^{s} \mathcal{H}_{ij} x_j'\big). \end{array} \tag{7}$$

Then the optimal solution x^+ defined by (5) *can be obtained exactly via*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} x_1^+ & = & \mathrm{argmin}_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_1} \ \phi(x_1) + h(x_1, x'_{\ge 2}) - \langle \delta_1, \, x_1 \rangle, \\ x_i^+ & = & \mathrm{argmin}_{x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i} \ \phi(x_1^+) + h(x^+_{\le i-1}, x_i, x'_{\ge i+1}) - \langle \delta_i, \, x_i \rangle \\ & = & \mathcal{H}_{ii}^{-1}\big(r_i + \delta_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{H}_{ji}^* x_j^+ - \sum_{j=i+1}^{s} \mathcal{H}_{ij} x_j'\big), \quad i = 2, \ldots, s. \end{array} \right. \tag{8}$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{D} \succ 0$, we know that $\mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U}^*$ are all nonsingular. The result in (6) can easily be obtained from the following observation

$$\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U} + \mathcal{U}^* + \mathcal{U}\mathcal{D}^{-1}\mathcal{U}^* = (\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U})\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U}^*). \tag{9}$$

Next we show the equivalence between (5) and (8). By noting that $\delta_1 = \delta_1'$ and $\mathcal{H}_{11} \succ 0$, we can define x_1' as follows:

$$x_1' = \mathop{\mathrm{argmin}}_{x_1} \ \phi(x_1) + h(x_1, x'_{\ge 2}) - \langle \delta_1', \, x_1 \rangle = \mathop{\mathrm{argmin}}_{x_1} \ \phi(x_1) + h(x_1, x'_{\ge 2}) - \langle \delta_1, \, x_1 \rangle = x_1^+. \tag{10}$$

The optimality conditions corresponding to x_1' and x_1^+ in (10) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{H}_{11} x_1' = r_1 - \gamma_1 + \delta_1' - \sum_{j=2}^{s} \mathcal{H}_{ij} x_j', & \text{(11a)} \\ \mathcal{H}_{11} x_1^+ = r_1 - \gamma_1 + \delta_1 - \sum_{j=2}^{s} \mathcal{H}_{ij} x_j', & \text{(11b)} \end{array} \right.$$

where $\gamma_1 \in \partial\phi(x_1') \equiv \partial\phi(x_1^+)$. Simple calculations show that (11a) together with (7) can equivalently be rewritten as

$$(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U})x' = r - \gamma + \delta' - \mathcal{U}^*\bar{x},$$

where $\gamma = (\gamma_1, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathcal{X}$, while (8) can equivalently be recast as

$$(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U}^*)x^+ = r - \gamma + \delta - \mathcal{U}x'.$$

By substituting $x' = (\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U})^{-1}(r - \gamma + \delta' - \mathcal{U}^*\bar{x})$ into the above equation, we have

$$\begin{array}{rl} (\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U}^*)x^+ & = r - \gamma + \delta - \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U})^{-1}(r - \gamma + \delta' - \mathcal{U}^*\bar{x}) \\ & = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U})^{-1}(r - \gamma) + \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U})^{-1}\mathcal{U}^*\bar{x} + \delta - \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{U})^{-1}\delta', \end{array}$$

which, together with (9), (4) and the definition of $\mathcal{O}$ in (3), implies that

$$(\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{O})x^+ = r - \gamma + \mathcal{O}\bar{x} + \Delta(\delta', \delta). \tag{12}$$

By noting that (12) is in fact the optimality condition for (5) and $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{O} \succ 0$, we have thus obtained the equivalence between (5) and (8). This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Remark 2.1. *In* (7) *and* (8)*, x_i' and x_i^+ should be regarded as inexact solutions to the corresponding minimization problems without the linear error terms $\langle \delta_i', x_i\rangle$ and $\langle \delta_i, x_i\rangle$. When the approximate solutions x_i' and x_i^+ have been computed, the corresponding error vectors δ_i' and δ_i are then given by:*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \delta_i' & = & \mathcal{H}_{ii}x_i' - \big(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\mathcal{H}_{ji}^*\bar{x}_j - \sum_{j=i+1}^{s}\mathcal{H}_{ij}x_j'\big), \quad i = s,\ldots,2 \\ \delta_1 & \in & \partial\phi(x_1^+) + \mathcal{H}_{11}x_1^+ - \big(r_1 - \sum_{j=2}^{s}\mathcal{H}_{1j}x_j'\big) \\ \delta_i & = & \mathcal{H}_{ii}x_i^+ - \big(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\mathcal{H}_{ji}^*x_j^+ - \sum_{j=i+1}^{s}\mathcal{H}_{ij}x_j'\big), \quad i = 2,\ldots,s. \end{array}$$

With the above known error vectors, we have that x_i' and x_i^+ are the exact solutions to the minimization problems in (7) *and* (8)*, respectively.*

The following proposition is useful in estimating the error term.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that $\widehat{\mathcal{H}} := \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{O}$ is positive definite. Let $\xi = \|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{-1/2}\Delta(\delta',\delta)\|$. It holds that*

$$\xi \le \|\mathcal{D}^{-1/2}(\delta - \delta')\| + \|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{-1/2}\delta'\|.$$

Proof. Recall that $\widehat{\mathcal{H}} = (\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{U})\mathcal{D}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{U}^*)$. Thus, we have

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} = (\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{U}^*)^{-1}\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{U})^{-1} = (\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{U}^*)^{-1}\mathcal{D}^{1/2}\mathcal{D}^{1/2}(\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{U})^{-1},$$

which, together with the definition of $\Delta(\delta',\delta)$ in (4), implies that

$$\xi = \|\mathcal{D}^{1/2}(\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{U})^{-1}\delta' + \mathcal{D}^{-1/2}(\delta-\delta')\| \le \|\mathcal{D}^{1/2}(\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{U})^{-1}\delta'\| + \|\mathcal{D}^{-1/2}(\delta-\delta')\|.$$

The desired result then follows. □

3 An inexact proximal augmented Lagrangian method

In this section, we propose an inexact proximal augmented Lagrangian method which serves as a prototype for our algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase II. Consider the following convex optimization problem

$$\min\{\, g(v) \;|\; \mathcal{G}^*v = c\}, \tag{13}$$

where $g : \mathcal{V} \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ is a closed proper convex function, $\mathcal{G} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{V}$ is a given linear map, $\mathcal{V}$ is a real finite dimensional Euclidean space. We denote by l the Lagrangian function for (13):

$$l(v,x) = g(v) + \langle x, \mathcal{G}^*v - c\rangle, \quad \forall (v,x) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{X}. \tag{14}$$

The optimality conditions (KKT conditions) for (13) are given by:

$$0 \in \partial g(v) + \mathcal{G}x, \quad \mathcal{G}^*v - c = 0. \tag{15}$$

Given $\sigma > 0$, the augmented Lagrangian function associated with (13) is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma(v,x) = g(v) + \langle x,\, \mathcal{G}^*v - c\rangle + \frac{\sigma}{2}\|\mathcal{G}^*v - c\|^2, \quad \forall (v,x) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{X}.$$

In this section, we study the following inexact proximal augmented Lagrangian method, which is a modification of the classical method proposed by Rockafellar in [24].

Algorithm ipALM: An inexact proximal augmented Lagrangian method of multipliers for solving (13)

Let $\sigma_0, \sigma_\infty > 0$ be given parameters, $\Lambda_1 : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V}$ be a given self-adjoint positive definite linear operator. Choose $(v^0, x^0) \in \mathrm{dom}(g) \times \mathcal{X}$. For $k = 0, 1, 2, ...,$ perform the following steps in each iteration.

Step 1. Compute

$$v^{k+1} \approx \operatorname*{argmin}_v \Big\{ \phi_k(v) := \mathcal{L}_{\sigma_k}(v, x^k) + \frac{1}{2\sigma_k}\|v - v^k\|^2_{\Lambda_1} \Big\}. \tag{16}$$

Step 2. Compute $x^{k+1} = x^k + \sigma_k(\mathcal{G}^* v^{k+1} - c)$.

Step 3. Update $\sigma_{k+1} \uparrow \sigma_\infty \leq \infty$.

Note that in the inner subproblem (16) of Algorithm ipALM, a more general positive definite proximal term $\frac{1}{2\sigma_k}\|v - v^k\|^2_{\Lambda_1}$ is added while in the classic proximal method of multipliers in [24], Λ_1 is required to be the identity operator. In [24], the positive definite proximal term is introduced to guarantee the existence of the optimal solution to the inner subproblem (16), and to ensure that the stopping criteria proposed for the inexact minimization procedure in (16) will be attainable. Our modification, however, emphasizes more on the aspect of making the subproblem easier to solve. Moreover, it will be necessary in our Phase II algorithm when the subspace constraint $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ is present.

To establish the convergence of Algorithm ipALM, we will adapt the theory developed by Rockafellar in [23, 24]. To this end, for $k = 0, 1, \ldots,$ and any given $(\bar{v}, \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X}$, we first define the function:

$$P_k(\bar{v}, \bar{x}) := \arg\operatorname*{minimax}_{v,x} \Big\{ l(v, x) + \frac{1}{2\sigma_k}\|v - \bar{v}\|^2_{\Lambda_1} - \frac{1}{2\sigma_k}\|x - \bar{x}\|^2 \Big\}. \tag{17}$$

Corresponding to the closed proper convex-concave function l, we can define the maximal monotone operator $\mathcal{T}_l$ [22, Corollary 37.5.2], by

$$\mathcal{T}_l(v, x) := \{(v', x') \,|\, (v', -x') \in \partial l(v, x)\},$$

whose corresponding inverse operator is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_l^{-1}(v', x') := \arg\operatorname*{minimax}_{v,x} \{l(v; x) - \langle v', v\rangle + \langle x', x\rangle\}. \tag{18}$$

Let

$$\Lambda = \mathrm{Diag}\,(\Lambda_1, I) \succ 0 \tag{19}$$

and $\lambda_{\max} \geq \lambda_{\min} > 0$ be the smallest and largest eigenvalues of Λ, respectively. Define the function

$$\widetilde{l}(v, x) \equiv l(\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v, x)), \quad \forall\, (v, x) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{X},$$

which is also a closed proper convex-concave function. Thus, associated with $\widetilde{l}$, we can define the maximal monotone operator $\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}$ as

$$\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}(v,x) := \{(v',x') \,|\, (v',-x') \in \partial\widetilde{l}(v,x)\}.$$

We know by simple calculations that

$$\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}(v,x) \equiv \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{T}_l(\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(v,x)), \quad \forall\,(v,x) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{X},$$

and $\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}^{-1}(0) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{T}_l^{-1}(\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}0)$.

The optimal solution of problem (17), i.e., $P_k(\bar{v},\bar{x})$, can be obtained via the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $k \geq 0$, it holds that*

$$P_k(\bar{v},\bar{x}) = \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{I}+\sigma_k\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}})^{-1}(\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{v},\bar{x})), \quad \forall\,(\bar{v},\bar{x}) \in \mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{X}. \tag{20}$$

Now, we analyze the convergence properties of Algorithm ipALM by applying the general theory of proximal point algorithm (PPA) for maximal monotone operators [23] to it. The key to this application is the following proposition, which is in fact a generalization of [24, Proposition 8].

Proposition 3.1. *Let ϕ_k, P_k and Λ be defined in* (16), (17) *and* (19), *respectively. Let (v^{k+1},x^{k+1}) be generated by* Algorithm ipALM. *It holds that*

$$\|\Lambda^{1/2}(v^{k+1},x^{k+1}) - \Lambda^{1/2}P_k(v^k,x^k)\| \leq \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}}}\,\mathrm{dist}(0,\partial\phi_k(v^{k+1})). \tag{21}$$

Proof. From the definition of $\phi_k(\cdot)$ in (16), we know that $\partial\phi_k(v^{k+1}) = \partial_v\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_k}(v^{k+1},x^k)+\sigma_k^{-1}\Lambda_1(v^{k+1}-v^k)$. Therefore, for any $\xi \in \partial\phi_k(v^{k+1})$, we have

$$\xi + \sigma_k^{-1}\Lambda_1(v^k - v^{k+1}) \in \partial_v\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_k}(v^{k+1},x^k),$$

which, by [24, Proposition 7], implies $(\xi+\sigma_k^{-1}\Lambda_1(v^k-v^{k+1}),\sigma_k^{-1}(x^k-x^{k+1})) \in \mathcal{T}_l(v^{k+1},x^{k+1})$. Thus,

$$\sigma_k\Lambda^{-1/2}(\xi,0) + \Lambda^{1/2}((v^k,x^k)-(v^{k+1},x^{k+1})) \in \sigma_k\Lambda^{-1/2}\mathcal{T}_l\Lambda^{-1/2}(\Lambda^{1/2}(v^{k+1},x^{k+1}))$$

and $\sigma_k\Lambda^{-1/2}(\xi,0)+\Lambda^{1/2}(v^k,x^k) \in (\mathcal{I}+\sigma_k\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}})(\Lambda^{1/2}(v^{k+1},x^{k+1}))$, or equivalently,

$$\Lambda^{1/2}(v^{k+1},x^{k+1}) = (\mathcal{I}+\sigma_k\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}})^{-1}(\sigma_k\Lambda^{-1/2}(\xi,0)+\Lambda^{1/2}(v^k,x^k)).$$

Then, by Lemma 3.1 and the nonexpansive property of the proximal mapping associated with the maximal monotone operator $\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\Lambda^{1/2}(v^{k+1},x^{k+1}) - \Lambda^{1/2}P_k(v^k,x^k)\| \\
&= \|(\mathcal{I}+\sigma_k\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}})^{-1}(\sigma_k\Lambda^{-1/2}(\xi,0)+\Lambda^{1/2}(v^k,x^k)) - (\mathcal{I}+\sigma_k\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}})^{-1}(\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(v^k,x^k))\| \\
&\leq \|\sigma_k\Lambda^{-1/2}(\xi,0)\| \leq \frac{\sigma_k}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}}}\|\xi\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Since (22) holds for all $\xi \in \partial\phi_k(v^{k+1})$, we obtain the desired result. □

Next, we shall discuss the stopping criteria for the subproblem (16) in Algorithm ipALM. Following [23, 24], we propose the following stopping criteria to terminate the subproblem in Algorithm ipALM:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{(A)} \qquad \mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\phi_k(v^{k+1})) \le \frac{\varepsilon_k\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}}}{\sigma_k}, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\varepsilon_k < +\infty, \\ &\text{(B)} \qquad \mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\phi_k(v^{k+1})) \le \frac{\delta_k\lambda_{\min}}{\sigma_k}\|(v^{k+1}, x^{k+1}) - (v^k, x^k)\|, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\delta_k < +\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

After all these preparations, we can state the global convergence of Algorithm ipALM from Rockafellar [23, 24] without much difficulty.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that the solution set to the KKT system* (15) *is nonempty. Then the sequence* $\{(v^k, x^k)\}$ *generated by ipALM with stopping criterion* (A) *is bounded. In addition,* $\{v^k\}$ *converges to an optimal solution of (13),* $\{x^k\}$ *converges to an optimal solution of the corresponding dual problem.*

To study the local convergence rate of our proposed Algorithm ipALM, we need the following error bound assumption used in [15].

Assumption 1 (Error bound)**.** *For a maximal monotone operator* $\mathcal{T}(\xi)$ *with* $\mathcal{T}^{-1}(0)$ *nonempty, there exist* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $a > 0$ *such that*

$$\forall \eta \in \mathcal{B}(0, \varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall \xi \in \mathcal{T}^{-1}(\eta), \quad \mathrm{dist}(\xi, \mathcal{T}^{-1}(0)) \le a\|\eta\|. \tag{24}$$

Remark 3.1. *The error bound assumption* (24) *holds automatically when* $\mathcal{T}$ *is a polyhedral multifunction [21]. Specifically, for a convex piecewise quadratic programming problem [28], Assumption 1 holds for the corresponding* $\mathcal{T}_l$*.*

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that* $\Omega := \mathcal{T}_l^{-1}(0)$ *is nonempty and that there exist* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $a > 0$ *such that*

$$\forall\, u \in \mathcal{B}(0, \varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall\, w \in \mathcal{T}_l^{-1}(u), \quad \mathrm{dist}(w, \Omega) \le a\|u\|.$$

Then, we have that $\widetilde{\Omega} := \mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}^{-1}(0) = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\Omega$ *is nonempty, and*

$$\forall\, \widetilde{u} \in \mathcal{B}(0, \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall\, \widetilde{w} \in \mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}^{-1}(\widetilde{u}), \quad \mathrm{dist}(\widetilde{w}, \widetilde{\Omega}) \le a\lambda_{\max}\|\widetilde{u}\|,$$

i.e., the error bound assumption also holds for $\mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}$*.*

Proof. For any given $\widetilde{u} \in \mathcal{B}(0, \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}}})$ and $\widetilde{w} \in \mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}}^{-1}(\widetilde{u})$, let

$$u = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{u} \quad \text{and} \quad w = \Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{w}.$$

We have that $\|u\| = \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{u}\| \le \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}}\|\widetilde{u}\| \le \varepsilon$ and $w \in \mathcal{T}_l^{-1}(u)$. Thus, $\mathrm{dist}(w, \Omega) \le a\|u\|$. Since Ω is a closed nonempty set, there exists $w_0 \in \Omega$ such that $\mathrm{dist}(w, \Omega) = \|w - w_0\|$. For $\widetilde{w}_0 = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}w_0 \in \widetilde{\Omega}$, we therefore have

$$a\|u\| \ge \mathrm{dist}(w, \Omega) = \|w - w_0\| = \|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\widetilde{w} - \widetilde{w}_0)\| \ge \frac{\|\widetilde{w} - \widetilde{w}_0\|}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}}} \ge \frac{\mathrm{dist}(\widetilde{w}, \widetilde{\Omega})}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}}}.$$

Thus, $\mathrm{dist}(\widetilde{w}, \widetilde{\Omega}) \le \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}}a\|u\| \le a\lambda_{\max}\|\widetilde{u}\|$. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

We are now ready to present the local linear convergence of Algorithm ipALM.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds for $\mathcal{T}_l$, i.e., $\Omega = \mathcal{T}_l^{-1}(0)$ is nonempty and there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $a > 0$ such that*

$$\forall\, u \in \mathcal{B}(0,\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall\, w \in \mathcal{T}_l^{-1}(u), \quad \mathrm{dist}(w,\Omega) \le a\|u\|.$$

Let $\{w^k\} = \{(v^k, x^k)\}$ be the sequence generated by ipALM with stopping criterion (B)*. Let $\widetilde{w}^k = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} w^k$ and $\widetilde{\Omega} = \Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\Omega$. Then, for all k sufficiently large,*

$$\mathrm{dist}(\widetilde{w}^{k+1}, \widetilde{\Omega}) \;\le\; \theta_k \mathrm{dist}(\widetilde{w}^k, \widetilde{\Omega}),$$

where $\theta_k = \Big(\frac{a\lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{a^2\lambda_{\max}^2+\sigma_k^2}} + 2\delta_k\Big)(1-\delta_k)^{-1} \to \theta_\infty = \frac{a\lambda_{\max}}{\sqrt{a^2\lambda_{\max}^2+\sigma_\infty^2}}$ as $k \to +\infty$.

Proof. Note that stopping criterion (B) implies

$$\|\widetilde{w}^{k+1} - (\mathcal{I} + \sigma_k \mathcal{T}_{\widetilde{l}})^{-1}(\widetilde{w}^k)\| \le \delta_k \|\widetilde{w}^{k+1} - \widetilde{w}^k\|, \quad \textstyle\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \delta_k < +\infty.$$

Therefore, by combining Proposition 3.2 and [15, Theorem 2.1], we obtain the desired results. □

4 Inexact ABCD algorithms for solving the inner subproblems (16) in ipALM

In this section, we will adapt the recently developed inexact accelerated block coordinate descent (ABCD) algorithm [27] to solve the inner subproblems in the proximal augmented Lagrangian method (2), where each subproblem takes the form of:

$$\min \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Psi(Z,W,S,y) := \mathcal{L}_\sigma(Z,W,S,y;\widehat{X}) + \dfrac{1}{2\sigma}\|(Z,W,S,y) - (\widehat{Z},\widehat{W},\widehat{S},\hat{y})\|_{\Lambda_1}^2 \\ \quad \mid\; (Z,W,S,y) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \end{array} \right\} \tag{25}$$

for a given $(\widehat{Z},\widehat{W},\widehat{S},\hat{y},\widehat{X}) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \times \mathcal{S}^n$, and $\Lambda_1 := \mathrm{Diag}(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{Q},\mathcal{I},\mathcal{I})$ with $\mathcal{I}$ denoting the identity operator defined on the appropriate space. It is important to emphasize that due to our choice of $\mathcal{W} = \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$, $\Psi(\cdot)$ is in fact a strongly convex function on $\mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m$. Thus, for any $\alpha \in \Re$, the level set $\mathcal{L}_\alpha := \{(Z,W,S,y) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \mid \Psi(Z,W,S,y) \le \alpha\}$ is a closed and bounded convex set. Meanwhile, problem (25) admits a unique optimal solution denoted as (Z^*,W^*,S^*,y^*).

We will present two variants of the ABCD algorithm to be used here. In the first variant, (Z,W,S,y) is decomposed into two groups, namely Z and (W,S,y). In this case, (W,S,y) is regarded as a single block and the corresponding subproblem in the ABCD algorithm can only be solved by an iterative method inexactly. We will design a semismooth Newton-CG (SNCG) method to solve the subproblem later in Subsection 4.1. In the second variant, we write (Z,W,S,y) as $(Z,W,(S,y))$, i.e., W and (S,y) are handled separately. The block (S,y) again will be computed via the semismooth Newton-CG method for solving the corresponding subproblem.

The detail steps of the first variant of the inexact ABCD algorithm are given as follows.

Algorithm ABCD1$(Z^0, W^0, S^0, y^0, \widehat{X}, \sigma)$: **An inexact ABCD algorithm for** (25)**.**

Given $(W^0, S^0, y^0) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n_+ \times \Re^m$ and $-Z^0 \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}})$, set $(\widetilde{Z}^1, \widetilde{W}^1, \widetilde{S}^1, \tilde{y}^1) = (Z^0, W^0, S^0, y^0)$ and $t_1 = 1$. Let $\{\varepsilon_l\}$ be a nonnegative summable sequence. For $l = 1, \ldots,$ perform the following steps in each iteration.

Step 1. Let $\widetilde{R}^l = \sigma(\widetilde{S}^k + \mathcal{A}^*\tilde{y}^l - \mathcal{Q}\widetilde{W}^l - C + \sigma^{-1}\widehat{X})$. Compute

$$Z^l = \mathrm{argmin}\big\{\Psi(Z, \widetilde{W}^l, \widetilde{S}^l, \tilde{y}^l) \mid Z \in \mathcal{S}^n\big\} = \frac{1}{\sigma}\big(\Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(\widetilde{R}^l) - \widetilde{R}^l\big),$$

$$(W^l, S^l, y^l) = \mathrm{argmin}\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Psi(Z^l, W, S, y) - \langle \delta^l_y,\, y\rangle - \langle \delta^l_{\mathcal{Q}},\, W\rangle \\ \quad \mid (W, S, y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \end{array} \right\}, \tag{26}$$

where $\delta^l_y \in \Re^m$, $\delta^l_{\mathcal{Q}} \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ are error vectors such that

$$\max\{\|\delta^l_y\|, \|\delta^l_{\mathcal{Q}}\|\} \le \varepsilon_l/t_l.$$

Step 2. Set $t_{l+1} = \frac{1+\sqrt{1+4t_l^2}}{2}$, $\beta_l = \frac{t_l - 1}{t_{l+1}}$. Compute

$$\widetilde{W}^{l+1} = W^l + \beta_l(W^l - W^{l-1}),\ \widetilde{S}^{l+1} = S^l + \beta_l(S^l - S^{l-1}),\ \tilde{y}^{l+1} = y^l + \beta_l(y^l - y^{l-1}).$$

As mentioned above, we will design a semismooth Newton-CG algorithm to solve the subproblem (26) later in Subsection 4.1. Let

$$d^{1,l} := \Big(\sigma\big((S^l - \widetilde{S}^l) + \mathcal{A}^*(y^l - \tilde{y}^l) - \mathcal{Q}(W^l - \widetilde{W}^l)\big),\ \delta^l_Q,\ 0,\ \delta^l_y\Big). \tag{27}$$

From the optimality conditions for (26) and the definition of $\Psi(\cdot)$, we can prove the following results for each l:

$$d^{1,l} \in \partial\Psi(Z^l, W^l, S^l, y^l). \tag{28}$$

Next we describe the second variant of the inexact ABCD algorithm for solving (25), whose steps are given as follows.

Algorithm ABCD2$(Z^0, W^0, S^0, y^0, \widehat{X}, \sigma)$**: An inexact ABCD algorithm for** (25)**.**

Given $(W^0, S^0, y^0) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n_+ \times \Re^m$ and $-Z^0 \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}})$, set $(\widetilde{Z}^1, \widetilde{W}^1, \widetilde{S}^1, \tilde{y}^1) = (Z^0, W^0, S^0, y^0)$ and $t_1 = 1$. Let $\{\varepsilon_l\}$ be a nonnegative summable sequence. For $l = 1, \ldots,$ perform the following steps in each iteration.

Step 1. Let $\widetilde{R}^l = \sigma(\widetilde{S}^k + \mathcal{A}^*\tilde{y}^l - \mathcal{Q}\widetilde{W}^l - C + \sigma^{-1}\widehat{X})$. Compute

$$\begin{aligned}
Z^l &= \mathrm{argmin}\big\{\Psi(Z, \widetilde{W}^l, \widetilde{S}^l, \tilde{y}^l) \mid Z \in \mathcal{S}^n\big\} = \frac{1}{\sigma}\big(\Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(\widetilde{R}^l) - \widetilde{R}^l\big),\\
\widehat{W}^l &= \mathrm{argmin}\big\{\Psi(Z^l, W, \widetilde{S}^l, \tilde{y}^l) - \langle \hat{\delta}^l_{\mathcal{Q}}, W\rangle, \mid W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})\big\},\\
(S^l, y^l) &= \mathrm{argmin}\big\{\Psi(Z^l, \widehat{W}^l, S, y) - \langle \delta^l_y, y\rangle \mid (S, y) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m\big\},\\
W^l &= \mathrm{argmin}\big\{\Psi(Z^l, W, S^l, y^l) - \langle \delta^l_{\mathcal{Q}}, W\rangle, \mid W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})\big\},
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $\delta^l_y \in \Re^m$, $\hat{\delta}^l_{\mathcal{Q}}, \delta^l_{\mathcal{Q}} \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ are error vectors such that

$$\max\{\|\delta^l_y\|, \|\hat{\delta}^l_{\mathcal{Q}}\|, \|\delta^l_{\mathcal{Q}}\|\} \le \varepsilon_l/t_l.$$

Step 2. Set $t_{l+1} = \frac{1+\sqrt{1+4t_l^2}}{2}$, $\beta_l = \frac{t_l - 1}{t_{l+1}}$. Compute

$$\widetilde{W}^{l+1} = W^l + \beta_l(W^l - W^{l-1}),\ \widetilde{S}^{l+1} = S^l + \beta_l(S^l - S^{l-1}),\ \tilde{y}^{l+1} = y^l + \beta_l(y^l - y^{l-1}).$$

Note that the inner subproblem involving the block (S, y) in (29) will again be solved by a semismooth Netwon-CG algorithm similar to the one to be described in Subsection 4.1. Let

$$d^{2,l} := \big(\sigma\big((S^l - \widetilde{S}^l) + \mathcal{A}^*(y^l - \tilde{y}^l) - \mathcal{Q}(W^l - \widetilde{W}^l)\big),\ \delta^l_Q,\ \sigma\mathcal{Q}(\widehat{W}^l - W^l),\ \delta^l_y + \sigma\mathcal{A}\mathcal{Q}(\widehat{W}^l - W^l)\big). \tag{30}$$

From the optimality conditions in (29), we can prove that

$$d^{2,l} \in \partial\Psi(Z^l, W^l, S^l, y^l). \tag{31}$$

The convergence results for the above Algorithm ABCD1 and ABCD2 are stated in the next theorem, whose proof follows from the strong convexity of $\Psi(\cdot)$ and [27, Theorem 3.1].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\{(Z^l, W^l, S^l, y^l)\}$ be the sequence generated by Algorithm ABCD1 (Algorithm ABCD2). Then*

$$\inf_Z \Psi(Z, W^l, S^l, y^l) - \Psi(Z^*, W^*, S^*, y^*) = O(1/l^2)$$

and $\{(Z^l, W^l, S^l, y^l)\}$ converges to the unique optimal solution (Z^*, W^*, S^*, y^*) of problem (25)*. Moreover, we have*

$$\lim_{l\to\infty} \|d^{1,l}\| = 0 \quad \Big(\lim_{l\to\infty} \|d^{2,l}\| = 0\Big)$$

with $d^{1,l}$ given in (27) *($d^{2,l}$ given in* (30)*).*

Proof. By [27, Theorem 3.1], we know that $\inf_Z \Psi(Z, W^l, S^l, y^l) - \Psi(Z^*, W^*, S^*, y^*) = O(1/l^2)$. The uniqueness of the optimal solution (Z^*, W^*, S^*, y^*) follows from the strong convexity of $\Psi(\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m$. Meanwhile, by using the strong convexity of $\inf_Z \Psi(Z, \cdot)$ on $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m$, we have

$$(W^l, S^l, y^l) \to (W^*, S^*, y^*)$$

and thus $\lim_{l\to\infty} \|d^{1,l}\| = 0$ if Algorithm ABCD1 is used. Similarly, $\lim_{l\to\infty} \|d^{2,l}\| = 0$ if Algorithm ABCD2 is used. Note that

$$Z^* = \operatorname*{argmin}_Z \Psi(Z, W^*, S^*, y^*) = \frac{1}{\sigma}\big(\Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(R^*) - R^*\big)$$

with $R^* = \sigma(S^* + \mathcal{A}^* y^* - \mathcal{Q}W^* - C + \sigma^{-1}\widehat{X})$. The fact $\widetilde{R}^l \to R^*$ and the Lipschitz continuity of $\Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(\cdot)$ then yield $Z^l = \frac{1}{\sigma}\big(\Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(\widetilde{R}^l) - \widetilde{R}^l\big) \to Z^*$. □

4.1 A semismooth Newton-CG algorithm for solving (26)

Next we shall discuss how the inner problems (26) involved in Algorithm ABCD1 can be solved efficiently. Given $\sigma > 0$ and $(\widehat{Z}, \widehat{W}, \widehat{S}, \hat{y}) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m$, for all $(W, y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m$, denote

$$\begin{array}{rcl} S(W,y) & := & -\sigma(\mathcal{Q}W - \mathcal{A}^* y + \widetilde{C}) - \sigma^{-1}\widehat{S}, \\ R(W,y) & := & \mathcal{A}^* y - \mathcal{Q}W - \widetilde{C} + \widehat{S} + \sigma\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(S(W,y)), \end{array} \tag{32}$$

where $\widetilde{C} = C - \sigma^{-1}\widehat{X} - \widehat{Z}$. Observe that if

$$(W^*, S^*, y^*) = \mathrm{argmin}\{\Psi(\widehat{Z}, W, S, y) \mid (W, S, y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m\}, \tag{33}$$

then (W^*, S^*, y^*) can be computed in the following manner

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (W^*, y^*) = \displaystyle\operatorname*{argmin}_{(W,y)\in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})\times\Re^m} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \varphi(W,y) := \frac{1}{2}\langle W,\ \mathcal{Q}W\rangle - \langle b,\ y\rangle + \frac{1}{2\hat{\sigma}}\|\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(S(W,y))\|^2 \\ +\frac{1}{2\hat{\sigma}}\|\mathcal{Q}W - \mathcal{A}^* y + \widetilde{C} - \widehat{S}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\sigma}(\|W - \widehat{W}\|^2_{\mathcal{Q}} + \|y - \hat{y}\|^2) \end{array} \right\}, \\ \\ S^* = \hat{\sigma}^{-1}\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(-S(W^*, y^*)), \end{array} \right.$$

where $\hat{\sigma} = \sigma + \sigma^{-1}$. Hence, to obtain (W^*, y^*), we need to solve the following optimization problem

$$\min\{\varphi(W,y) \mid W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}),\ y \in \Re^m\}. \tag{34}$$

Note that $\varphi(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a continuously differentiable function on $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m$ with

$$\nabla\varphi(W,y) = \left(\begin{array}{l} (1+\sigma^{-1})\mathcal{Q}W - \hat{\sigma}^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\big(R(W,y)\big) - \sigma^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\widehat{W} \\ -b + \hat{\sigma}^{-1}\mathcal{A}\big(R(W,y)\big) + \sigma^{-1}(y - \hat{y}) \end{array} \right).$$

Note that solving (34) is equivalent to solving the following nonsmooth equation:

$$\nabla\varphi(W,y) = 0, \quad (W,y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m. \tag{35}$$

Since $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}$ is strongly semismooth [25], we can design a semismooth Newton-CG (SNCG) method to solve (34) and could expect to get a fast superlinear or even quadratic convergence. For any $(W, y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m$, define

$$\hat{\partial}^2\varphi(W,y) := \begin{bmatrix} (1+\sigma^{-1})\mathcal{Q} & \\ & \sigma^{-1}\mathcal{I} \end{bmatrix} + \hat{\sigma}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q} \\ -\mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} \Big(\mathcal{I} + \sigma^2 \partial\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(S(W,y))\Big)[\mathcal{Q} \ -\mathcal{A}^*],$$

where $\partial\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(S(W,y))$ is the Clarke subdifferential [5] of $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(\cdot)$ at $S(W,y)$. Note that from [8], we know that

$$\hat{\partial}^2\varphi(W,y)\,(d_W, d_y) = \partial^2\varphi(W,y)\,(d_W, d_y), \quad \forall\,(d_W, d_y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m, \tag{36}$$

where $\partial^2\varphi(W,y)$ denotes the generalized Hessian of φ at (W,y), i.e., the Clarke subdifferential of $\nabla\varphi$ at (W,y).

Given $(\widetilde{W}, \tilde{y}) \in \mathrm{Range}(Q) \times \Re^m$, consider the following eigenvalue decomposition:

$$S(\widetilde{W}, \tilde{y}) = -\sigma(\mathcal{Q}\widetilde{W} - \mathcal{A}^*\tilde{y} + \widetilde{C}) - \sigma^{-1}\widehat{S} = P\,\Gamma\,P^{\mathrm{T}}, \tag{37}$$

where $P \in \Re^{n\times n}$ is an orthogonal matrix whose columns are eigenvectors, and Γ is the corresponding diagonal matrix of eigenvalues, arranged in a nonincreasing order: $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$. Define the following index sets

$$\alpha := \{i \mid \lambda_i > 0\}, \quad \bar{\alpha} := \{i \mid \lambda_i \leq 0\}.$$

We define the operator $U^0 : \mathcal{S}^n \to \mathcal{S}^n$ by

$$U^0(H) := P(\Sigma \circ (P^{\mathrm{T}}HP))P^{\mathrm{T}}, \quad H \in \mathcal{S}^n, \tag{38}$$

where " $\circ$ " denotes the Hadamard product of two matrices,

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} E_{\alpha\alpha} & \nu_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}} \\ \nu_{\alpha\bar{\alpha}}^{\mathrm{T}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \nu_{ij} := \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i - \lambda_j},\ i \in \alpha, j \in \bar{\alpha}, \tag{39}$$

and $E_{\alpha\alpha} \in \mathcal{S}^{|\alpha|}$ is the matrix of ones. In [17, Lemma 11], it is proved that

$$U^0 \in \partial\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(S(\widetilde{W}, \tilde{y})).$$

Define

$$V^0 := \begin{bmatrix} (1+\sigma^{-1})\mathcal{Q} & \\ & \sigma^{-1}\mathcal{I} \end{bmatrix} + \hat{\sigma}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q} \\ -\mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} (\mathcal{I} + \sigma^2 U^0)[\mathcal{Q} \ -\mathcal{A}^*]. \tag{40}$$

Then, we have $V^0 \in \hat{\partial}^2\varphi(\widetilde{W}, \tilde{y})$. Note that V^0 is positive definite on $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m$.

After all the above preparations, we can design the following semismooth Newton-CG method as in [35] to solve (34).

Algorithm SNCG: A semismooth Newton-CG algorithm.

Given $\mu \in (0, 1/2)$, $\bar{\eta} \in (0, 1)$, $\tau \in (0, 1]$, and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Choose $(W^0, y^0) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m$. Set $j = 0$. Iterate the following steps.

Step 1. Apply the CG algorithm to find an approximate solution $(d_W^j, d_y^j) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m$ to

$$V_j(d_W, d_y) \approx -\nabla\varphi(W^j, y^j), \tag{41}$$

where $V_j \in \hat{\partial}^2\varphi(W^j)$ is defined as in (40), such that

$$\|V_j(d_W^j, d_y^j) + \nabla\varphi(W^j, y^j)\| \le \eta_j := \min(\bar{\eta}, \|\nabla\varphi(W^j, y^j)\|^{1+\tau}). \tag{42}$$

Step 2. Set $\alpha_j = \delta^{m_j}$, where m_j is the first nonnegative integer m for which

$$\varphi(W^j + \delta^m d_W^j, y^j + \delta^m d_y^j) \le \varphi(W^j, y^j) + \mu\delta^m \langle \nabla\varphi(W^j, y^j), (d_W^j, d_y^j)\rangle. \tag{43}$$

Step 3. Set $W^{j+1} = W^j + \alpha_j\, d_W^j$ and $y^{j+1} = y^j + \alpha_j\, d_y^j$.

The convergence results for the above SNCG algorithm are stated in the next theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Let the sequence $\{(W^j, y^j)\}$ be generated by Algorithm SNCG. Suppose at each step $j \ge 0$, when the CG algorithm terminates, the stopping condition* (42) *is achieved, i.e.,*

$$\|V_j(d_W, d_y) + \nabla\varphi(W^j, y^j)\| \le \eta_j.$$

Then the sequence $\{(W^j, y^j)\}$ converges to the unique optimal solution $(\overline{W}, \bar{y})$ of the problem in (34) *and*

$$\|(W^{j+1}, y^{j+1}) - (\overline{W}, \bar{y})\| = O(\|(W^j, y^j) - (\overline{W}, \bar{y})\|)^{1+\tau}. \tag{44}$$

Proof. First we note that $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}_+^n}(\cdot)$ is strongly semismooth. Since $\varphi(W, y)$ is a strongly convex function on $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^n$, problem (34) has a unique solution $(\overline{W}, \bar{y})$ and the level set $\{(W, y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m \,|\, \varphi(W, y) \le \varphi(W^0, y^0)\}$ is compact. Therefore, the sequence generated by SNCG is bounded as (d_W^j, d_y^j) is a descent direction [35, Propsition 3.3]. Note that for all $(W, y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^n$, every $V \in \hat{\partial}^2\varphi(W, y)$ is self-adjoint and positive definite on $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^n$, the desired results can then be obtained from [35, Theorem 3.4 and 3.5]. □

It is clear that the positive definiteness of V_j in the semismooth Newton system (41) is guaranteed by adding the positive proximal terms corresponding to (W, S, y). Under the constraint nondegenerate condition for (**P**), we shall show in the next theorem that one can still ensure the positive definiteness of the coefficient matrix in the semismooth Newton system at the solution point even if the proximal terms are absent.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{S}^n \to \mathcal{S}^n$ be a self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator and $\sigma > 0$. Then, it holds that $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*$ is positive definite if and only if*

$$\left\langle \begin{bmatrix} W \\ y \end{bmatrix}, \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q} & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \sigma \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q} \\ -\mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}[\mathcal{Q} - \mathcal{A}^*] \right) \begin{bmatrix} W \\ y \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle > 0 \tag{45}$$

for all $(W, y) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m \backslash \{(0,0)\}$.

Proof. Since the "if" statement obviously holds true, we only need to prove the "only if" statement. Note that

$$\langle W,\, \mathcal{Q}W\rangle > 0, \quad \forall\, W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})\backslash\{0\}.$$

Now suppose that $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*$ is positive definite, and hence nonsingular. By the Schur complement condition for ensuring the positive definiteness of a linear operator, we know that (45) holds if and only if

$$\langle W,\, (\mathcal{Q} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{Q} - \sigma\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{Q})W\rangle > 0, \quad \forall\, W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})\backslash\{0\}. \tag{46}$$

But for any $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle W,\, (\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{Q} - \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{Q})W\rangle \;&=\; \langle W,\, \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{A}^*(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}^{\frac{1}{2}})\mathcal{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{Q}W\rangle \\ &=\; \langle \mathcal{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{Q}W,\, (\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{A}^*(\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}^{\frac{1}{2}})\mathcal{U}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{Q}W\rangle \;\geq\; 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, (46) holds automatically. This completes the proof of the proposition. □

When the proximal terms corresponding to (W, S, y) are absent, problem (34) now takes the following form

$$\min_{W\in\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}),\, y\in\Re^m} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\langle W,\, \mathcal{Q}W\rangle - \langle b,\, y\rangle + \frac{1}{2\sigma}\|\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(\widehat{X} + \sigma(\widehat{Z} - \mathcal{Q}W + \mathcal{A}^*y - C))\|^2 \right\}. \tag{47}$$

Theorem 4.3. *Let* $(\overline{W}, \bar{y})$ *be the optimal solution for problem* (47). *Let* $\overline{Y} := \Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(\widehat{X} + \sigma(\widehat{Z} + \mathcal{A}^*\bar{y} - \mathcal{Q}\overline{W} - C))$. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *The constraint nondegenerate condition,* $\mathcal{A}\,\mathrm{lin}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(\overline{Y})) = \Re^m$, *holds at* $\overline{Y}$, *where* $\mathrm{lin}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(\overline{Y}))$ *denotes the lineality space of the tangent cone of* $\mathcal{S}^n_+$ *at* $\overline{Y}$.

(ii) *Every element in*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q} & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \sigma \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q} \\ -\mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} \partial\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(\widehat{X} + \sigma(\widehat{Z} + \mathcal{A}^*\bar{y} - \mathcal{Q}\overline{W} - C))[\mathcal{Q}\ -\mathcal{A}^*]$$

is self-adjoint and positive definite on $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m$.

Proof. In the same fashion as in [35, Proposition 3.2], we can prove that $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{U}\mathcal{A}^*$ is positive definite for all $\mathcal{U} \in \partial\Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(\widehat{X} + \sigma(\widehat{Z} + \mathcal{A}^*\bar{y} - \mathcal{Q}\overline{W} - C))$ if only if (i) holds. Then, by Proposition 4.1, we readily obtain the desired results. □

5 A two-phase proximal augmented Lagrangian method

In this section, we shall present our two-phase algorithm QSDPNAL for solving the convex quadratic semidefinite programming problem (**D**). For the convergence of Algorithm QSDPNAL, we need the following Slater condition for (**P**).

Assumption 2. *Problem (***P***) satisfies the following Slater condition:*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{S}^n \to \Re^m \text{ is onto,} \\ \exists\, X_0 \in \mathcal{S}^n_+ \cap \mathcal{K} \text{ such that } \mathcal{A}(X_0) = b,\ X_0 \succ 0. \end{cases}$$

5.1 Phase I: An sGS based inexact semi-proximal ADMM

In Phase I, we propose a new variant of the sGS based inexact semi-proximal ADMM (sGS-isPADMM) developed in [4] to solve (**D**). Recall the augmented Lagrangian function associated with problem (**D**) defined in (1).

The detail steps of our Phase I algorithm for solving (**D**) are given as follows.

Algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase I: **An sGS based inexact semi-proximal ADMM for (D)**.

Select an initial point $(W^0, S^0, y^0, X^0) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n_+ \times \Re^m \times \mathcal{S}^n$ and $-Z^0 \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}})$. Let $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ be a summable sequence of nonnegative numbers, and $\sigma > 0$, $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ are given parameters. For $k = 0, 1, \ldots$, perform the following steps in each iteration.

Step 1. Compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{W}^k &= \mathrm{argmin}\{\mathcal{L}_\sigma(Z^k, W, S^k, y^k; X^k) - \langle \hat{\delta}^k_Q, W\rangle \mid W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})\}, \qquad (48)\\
Z^{k+1} &= \mathrm{argmin}\{\mathcal{L}_\sigma(Z, \widehat{W}^k, S^k, y^k; X^k) \mid Z \in \mathcal{S}^n\},\\
W^{k+1} &= \mathrm{argmin}\{\mathcal{L}_\sigma(Z^{k+1}, W, S^k, y^k; X^k) - \langle \delta^k_Q, W\rangle \mid W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})\}, \qquad (49)\\
\hat{y}^k &= \mathrm{argmin}\{\mathcal{L}_\sigma(Z^{k+1}, W^{k+1}, S^k, y; X^k) - \langle \hat{\delta}^k_y, y\rangle \mid y \in \Re^m\},\\
S^{k+1} &= \mathrm{argmin}\{\mathcal{L}_\sigma(Z^{k+1}, W^{k+1}, S, \hat{y}^k; X^k) \mid S \in \mathcal{S}^n\},\\
y^{k+1} &= \mathrm{argmin}\{\mathcal{L}_\sigma(Z^{k+1}, W^{k+1}, S^{k+1}, y; X^k) - \langle \delta^k_y, y\rangle \mid y \in \Re^m\},
\end{aligned}$$

where δ^k_E, $\hat{\delta}^k_E \in \Re^m$, $\delta^k_{\mathcal{Q}}$, $\hat{\delta}^k_{\mathcal{Q}} \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ are error vectors such that

$$\max\{\|\delta^k_y\|, \|\hat{\delta}^k_y\|, \|\delta^k_{\mathcal{Q}}\|, \|\hat{\delta}^k_{\mathcal{Q}}\|\} \le \varepsilon_k.$$

Step 2. Compute $X^{k+1} = X^k + \tau\sigma(Z^{k+1} - QW^{k+1} + S^{k+1} + \mathcal{A}^* y^{k+1} - C)$.

Remark 5.1. *In contrast to Aglorithm sGS-isPADMM in [4], our Algorithm* QSDPNAL-Phase I *requires the subspace constraint* $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ *explicitly in the subproblems* (48) *and* (49). *Note that due to the presence of the subspace constraint* $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$, *there is no need to add extra proximal terms corresponding to* W *in order to meet the positive definiteness requirement in using the inexact sGS decomposition technique (Theorem 2.1). This is more appealing to the indirect reformulation strategy considered in [14].*

The convergence of the above algorithm follows from [4, Theorem 1] without much difficulty.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that the solution set of* (**P**) *is nonempty and Assumption 2 holds. Let* $\{(Z^k, W^k, S^k, y^k, X^k)\}$ *be the sequence generated by Algorithm* QSDPNAL-Phase I. *If* $\tau \in (0, (1+\sqrt{5})/2)$, *then the sequence* $\{(Z^k, W^k, S^k, y^k)\}$ *converges to an optimal solution of* (**D**) *and* $\{X^k\}$ *converges to an optimal solution of* (**P**).

5.2 Phase II: An inexact proximal augmented Lagrangian algorithm

Next, we discuss our Phase II algorithm for solving the convex QSDP (**D**). The purpose of this phase is to obtain high accuracy solutions efficiently after warm-started by our Phase I algorithm.

The prototype algorithm ipALM described in Section 3, when applied to the problem (**D**), has the following template.

Algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase II: **An inexact proximal augmented Lagrangian method of multipliers for solving (D).**

Let $\sigma_0 > 0$ be a given parameter. Choose $(W^0, S^0, y^0, X^0) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n_+ \times \Re^m \times \mathcal{S}^n$ and $-Z^0 \in \mathrm{dom}(\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}})$. For $k = 0, 1, \ldots$, perform the following steps in each iteration.

Step 1. Compute

$$\begin{aligned}&(Z^{k+1}, W^{k+1}, S^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, d^{k+1})\\ &= \mathrm{ABCD1}(Z^k, W^k, S^k, y^k, X^k, \sigma^k) \quad \text{or} \quad \mathrm{ABCD2}(Z^k, W^k, S^k, y^k, X^k, \sigma^k),\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where d^{k+1} is obtained from (27) if Algorithm ABCD1 is used, or from (30) if Algorithm ABCD2 is used.

Step 2. Compute

$$X^{k+1} = X^k + \sigma_k(Z^{k+1} - \mathcal{Q}W^{k+1} + S^{k+1} + \mathcal{A}^* y^{k+1} - C).$$

Update $\sigma_{k+1} = \rho\sigma_k$ for some $\rho > 1$ or $\sigma_{k+1} = \sigma_k$.

At kth iteration in the above algorithm, by (28) (or (31)), we know that

$$d^{k+1} \in \partial\Psi_k(Z^{k+1}, W^{k+1}, S^{k+1}, y^{k+1}), \quad \forall\, k \geq 0 \tag{51}$$

with Ψ_k defined in (2). Let Λ be the self-adjoint positive definite linear operator defined by

$$\Lambda := \mathrm{Diag}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}) \tag{52}$$

on $\mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \times \mathcal{S}^n$. Let $\lambda_{\min} > 0$ be its smallest eigenvalue. We shall investigate the procedure (50) under the following stopping criteria:

$$\text{(A}') \quad \|d^{k+1}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_k\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}}}{\sigma_k}, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_k < +\infty,$$

$$\text{(B}') \quad \|d^{k+1}\| \leq \frac{\delta_k\lambda_{\min}}{\sigma_k}\|(Z^{k+1}, W^{k+1}, S^{k+1}, y^{k+1}, X^{k+1}) - (Z^k, W^k, S^k, y^k, X^k)\|, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \delta_k < +\infty.$$

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose that Algorithm* QSDPNAL*-Phase II is executed with stopping criterion* (A′) *and Assumption 2 holds. Then the sequence* $\{(Z^k, W^k, S^k, y^k, X^k)\}$ *generated by the algorithm is bounded, and* $\{X^k\}$ *converges to an optimal solution to* (**P**) *and* $\{(Z^k, W^k, S^k, y^k)\}$ *converges to an optimal solution to* (**D**).

Proof. By noting the fact that $\mathrm{dist}(0, \partial\Psi_k(Z^{k+1}, W^{k+1}, S^{k+1}, y^{k+1})) \leq \|d^{k+1}\|$, we obtain the results directly from Theorem 3.1. □

Suppose that $(\overline{Z},\overline{W},\overline{S},\bar{y},\overline{X}) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \times \mathcal{S}^n$ is a solution to the following KKT system:

$$\begin{cases} C - S - \mathcal{A}^* y + \mathcal{Q}W - Z = 0,\ \mathcal{Q}W - \mathcal{Q}X = 0, \\ 0 \in X + \partial\delta_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(S),\ \mathcal{A}X - b = 0,\ 0 \in X + \partial\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}}(-Z). \end{cases} \tag{53}$$

To establish the local linear convergence of Algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase II, we need the following assumptions.

Assumption 3. *The strict Robinson constraint qualifications (SRCQ) hold at $(\overline{Z},\overline{W},\overline{S},\bar{y},\overline{X})$ for (**P**) and (**D**), i.e.,*

$$\begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A} \\ \mathcal{I} \end{pmatrix} T_{\mathcal{S}^n_-}(-\overline{X}) \cap \overline{S}^{\perp} + \{0\} \times \left(T_{\mathcal{K}}(\overline{X}) \cap \overline{Z}^{\perp}\right) = \Re^m \times \mathcal{S}^n, \\ T_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(\overline{S}) \cap \overline{X}^{\perp} + \Gamma_{\overline{X},\overline{Z}} + \mathcal{A}^*\Re^m - \mathcal{Q}\,\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{S}^n, \end{cases} \tag{54}$$

where $\mathcal{S}^n_- := -\mathcal{S}^n_+$ and $\Gamma_{\overline{X},\overline{Z}}$ is a nonempty closed convex cone defined by

$$\Gamma_{\overline{X},\overline{Z}} := \{U \in \mathcal{S}^n \mid \langle U, \overline{X}\rangle + (\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}})'(-\overline{Z}; -U) = 0\}.$$

Remark 5.2. *From [6, Therorem 5.1], it is easy to see that under Assumption 3, the maximal monotone operator T_l corresponding to (**P**) and (**D**) satisfies Assumption 1.*

Next we state the local linear convergence of Algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase II.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that $(\overline{Z},\overline{W},\overline{S},\bar{y},\overline{X}) \in \mathcal{S}^n \times \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \mathcal{S}^n \times \Re^m \times \mathcal{S}^n$ is a solution to the KKT system (53). Let Algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase II be executed with stopping criterion (B′). Suppose that Assumption 3 holds at $(\overline{Z},\overline{W},\overline{S},\bar{y},\overline{X})$, then the sequence $\{(Z^k,W^k,S^k,y^k,X^k)\}$ converges to $(\overline{Z},\overline{W},\overline{S},\bar{y},\overline{X})$, i.e., the unique solution to the KKT system (53), and for all k sufficiently large,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(Z^{k+1},W^{k+1},S^{k+1},y^{k+1},X^{k+1}) - (\overline{Z},\overline{W},\overline{S},\bar{y},\overline{X})\|_\Lambda \\ &\le \theta_\infty \|(Z^k,W^k,S^k,y^k,X^k) - (\overline{Z},\overline{W},\overline{S},\bar{y},\overline{X})\|_\Lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

for some $\theta_\infty \in (0,1)$ with the property that $\theta_\infty \ll 1$ if $\sigma_k \to \sigma_\infty$ for any sufficiently large σ_∞.

Proof. The conclusions follow from the results in [6, Theorem 5.1] and Theorem 3.2. □

6 Numerical issues in QSDPNAL

In Algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase I, in order to obtain $\widehat{W}^k$ and W^{k+1} at the kth iteration, we need to solve the following linear system of equations

$$(\mathcal{Q} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}^2)W \approx \mathcal{Q}R, \quad W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \tag{56}$$

with the residual

$$\|\mathcal{Q}R - (\mathcal{Q} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}^2)W\| \le \varepsilon, \tag{57}$$

where $R \in \mathcal{S}^n$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are given. Note that the exact solution to (56) is unique since $\mathcal{Q} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}^2$ is positive definite on $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$. But the linear system is typically very large even for a moderate

n, say $n = 500$. Under the high dimensional setting which we are particularly interested in, the matrix representation of $\mathcal{Q}$ is generally not available or too expensive to be stored explicitly. Thus (56) can only be solved inexactly by an iterative method. However when $\mathcal{Q}$ is singular (and hence $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \neq \mathcal{S}^n$), due to the presence of the subspace constraint $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$, it is extremely difficult to apply preconditioning to (56) while ensuring that the approximate solution is contained in $\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$. Fortunately, as shown in the next proposition, instead of solving (56) directly, we can solve a simpler and yet better conditioned linear system to overcome this difficulty.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\widehat{W}$ be an approximate solution to the following linear system:*

$$(\mathcal{I} + \sigma\mathcal{Q})W \approx R \tag{58}$$

with the residual satisfying

$$\|R - (\mathcal{I} + \sigma\mathcal{Q})\widehat{W}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\|\mathcal{Q}\|}. \tag{59}$$

Then, $\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}} := \Pi_{\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})}(\widehat{W}) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ solves (56) with the residual satisfying (57). Moreover, $\mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}$ and $\langle \widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle = \langle \widehat{W}, \mathcal{Q}\widehat{W} \rangle$.

Proof. First we note that the results $\mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}$ and $\langle \widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle = \langle \widehat{W}, \mathcal{Q}\widehat{W} \rangle$ follow from the decomposition $\widehat{W} = \Pi_{\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})}(\widehat{W}) + \Pi_{\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})^{\perp}}(\widehat{W})$. Next, by observing that

$$\|\mathcal{Q}R - (\mathcal{Q} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}^2)\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}}\| = \|\mathcal{Q}R - (\mathcal{Q} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}^2)\widehat{W}\| \leq \|\mathcal{Q}\| \, \|R - (\mathcal{I} + \sigma\mathcal{Q})\widehat{W}\| \leq \|\mathcal{Q}\| \frac{\varepsilon}{\|\mathcal{Q}\|} = \varepsilon,$$

one can easily obtain the desired results. □

By Proposition 6.1, in order to obtain $\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, we can first apply an iterative method such as the preconditioned conjugate gradient (PCG) method to solve (58) to obtain $\widehat{W}$ and then perform the projection step. However, by carefully analysing the steps in QSDPNAL-Phase I, we are delighted to observe that instead of explicitly computing $\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}}$, we can update the iterations in the algorithm by using only $\mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}$. Thus, we only need to compute $\mathcal{Q}\widehat{W}$ and the projection step to compute $\widehat{W}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is not necessary.

It is important for us to emphasize the computational advantage of solving the linear system (58) over (56). First, the former only requires one evaluation of $\mathcal{Q}(\cdot)$ whereas the latter requires two such evaluations in each PCG iteration. Second, the coefficient matrix in the former system is typically much more well-conditioned than the coefficient matrix in the latter system. More precisely, when $\mathcal{Q}$ is positive definite, then $\mathcal{I} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}$ is clearly better conditioned than $\mathcal{Q} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}^2$. When $\mathcal{Q}$ is singular, with its smallest positive eigenvalue denoted as $\lambda_+(\mathcal{Q})$, then $\mathcal{I} + \sigma\mathcal{Q}$ is better conditioned when $\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{Q}) \geq \lambda_+(\mathcal{Q})(1 + \sigma\lambda_+(\mathcal{Q}))$. The previous inequality would obviously hold when $\lambda_+ \leq (\sqrt{4\sigma\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{Q}) + 1} - 1)/(2\sigma)$.

In Algorithm QSDPAL-Phase II, the subspace constraint $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ also appears when we solve the semismooth Newton linear system (40) in Algorithm SNCG. Specifically, we need to find (dW, dy) to solve the following linear system

$$V\,(dW, dy) \approx (\mathcal{Q}(R_1), R_2), \quad (dW, dy) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}) \times \Re^m \tag{60}$$

with the residual satisfying the following condition

$$\|V\,(dW, dy) - (\mathcal{Q}(R_1), R_2)\| \leq \eta, \tag{61}$$

where

$$V := \begin{bmatrix} (1+\sigma^{-1})\mathcal{Q} & \\ & \sigma^{-1}\mathcal{I} \end{bmatrix} + \hat{\sigma}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q} \\ -\mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} (\mathcal{I} + \sigma^2 \mathcal{U})[\mathcal{Q} \ -\mathcal{A}^*]$$

and $\mathcal{U}$ is a given self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator on $\mathcal{S}^n$. Again, instead of solving (60) directly, we can solve a simpler linear system to compute $\mathcal{Q}(dW)$ approximately, as shown in the next proposition.

Proposition 6.2. *Let*

$$\widehat{V} := \begin{bmatrix} (1+\sigma^{-1})\mathcal{I} & \\ & \sigma^{-1}\mathcal{I} \end{bmatrix} + \hat{\sigma}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{I} \\ -\mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} (\mathcal{I} + \sigma^2 \mathcal{U})[\mathcal{Q} \ -\mathcal{A}^*].$$

Suppose $(\widehat{dW}, \widehat{dy})$ *is an approximate solution to the following system:*

$$\widehat{V}\,(dW, dy) \approx (R_1, R_2) \tag{62}$$

with the residual satisfying

$$\|\widehat{V}\,(\widehat{dW}, \widehat{dy}) - (R_1, R_2)\| \le \frac{\eta}{\|\mathrm{Diag}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{I})\|}.$$

Let $\widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \Pi_{\mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})}(\widehat{dW}) \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$ *Then* $(\widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \widehat{dy})$ *solves* (60) *with the residual satisfying* (61)*. Moreover,* $\mathcal{Q}\,\widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathcal{Q}\,\widehat{dW}$ *and* $\langle \widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}},\, \mathcal{Q}\,\widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle = \langle \widehat{dW},\, \mathcal{Q}\,\widehat{dW} \rangle$*.*

Proof. The proof that $\mathcal{Q}\,\widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \mathcal{Q}\,\widehat{dW}$ and $\langle \widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}},\, \mathcal{Q}\,\widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle = \langle \widehat{dW},\, \mathcal{Q}\,\widehat{dW} \rangle$ is the same as in the previous proposition. Observe that $V = \mathrm{Diag}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{I})\widehat{V}$. Then, by using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|V\,[\widehat{dW}_{\mathcal{Q}}; \widehat{dy}] - [\mathcal{Q}(R_1); R_2]\| = \|V\,(\widehat{dW}, \widehat{dy}) - (\mathcal{Q}(R_1), R_2)\| \\ \le\ &\|\mathrm{Diag}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{I})\|\,\|\widehat{V}\,(\widehat{dW}, \widehat{dy}) - (R_1, R_2)\| \le \|\mathrm{Diag}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{I})\| \frac{\eta}{\|\mathrm{Diag}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{I})\|} = \eta, \end{aligned}$$

one can obtain the desired results readily. □

7 QSDPNAL for semidefinite matrix least squares problems

In this section, we show that for semidefinite matrix least squares problems, QSDPNAL can be used in a smart way to avoid the difficulty of handling the subspace constraint $W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q})$.

Consider the following semidefinite matrix least squares problem

$$\min \Big\{ \frac{1}{2}\|\mathcal{B}X - d\|^2 + \langle C,\, X \rangle \ \mid\ \mathcal{A}X = b,\ X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+ \cap \mathcal{K} \Big\}, \tag{63}$$

where $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{S}^n \to \Re^m$ and $\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{S}^n \to \Re^s$ are two linear maps, $C \in \mathcal{S}^n$, $b \in \Re^m$ and $d \in \Re^s$ are given data, $\mathcal{K}$ is a simple nonempty closed convex polyhedral set in $\mathcal{S}^n$.

It is easy to see that (63) can be rewritten as follows

$$\min \Big\{ \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 + \langle C,\, X \rangle \ \mid\ \mathcal{B}X - d = u,\ \mathcal{A}X = b,\ X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+ \cap \mathcal{K} \Big\}. \tag{64}$$

The dual of (64) takes the following form

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max & -\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}}(-Z) - \dfrac{1}{2}\|\xi\|^2 + \langle d,\, \xi\rangle + \langle b,\, y\rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & Z + \mathcal{B}^*\xi + S + \mathcal{A}^* y = C, \quad S \in \mathcal{S}^n_+. \end{array} \tag{65}$$

When QSDPNAL-Phase I is applied to solve (65), instead of solving (56), the linear system corresponding to the quadratic term is given by

$$(\mathcal{I} + \sigma\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B}^*)\xi \approx R, \tag{66}$$

where $R \in \Re^s$ and $\sigma > 0$ are given data. Meanwhile, in QSDPNAL-Phase II, the linear system in the SNCG method corresponding to problem (65) is given by

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{I} & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \sigma \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B} \\ \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}^* & \mathcal{A}^* \end{bmatrix}\right) \begin{bmatrix} d\xi \\ dy \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} R_1 \\ R_2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{67}$$

where $R_1 \in \Re^s$ and $R_2 \in \Re^m$ are given data, $\mathcal{U}$ is a given self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator on $\mathcal{S}^n$. Note that here we omit the positive definite proximal terms added in QSDPNAL-Phase II for simplicity. It is clear that just like (58), one can solve (66) efficiently via the PCG method. For (67), one can also solve it by the PCG method, which is more appealing compared to using a nonsymmetric iterative solver such as the preconditioned BiCGSTAB to solve the nonsymmetric linear system (62).

Remark 7.1. *When the polyhedral constraint $X \in \mathcal{K}$ in* (63) *is absent, i.e., the polyhedral convex set $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S}^n$, Jiang, Sun and Toh in [10] proposed the partial proximal point algorithm for solving the semidefinite matrix least squares problem* (63)*. Hence, Algorithm* QSDPNAL *can be viewed as a generalization of their algorithm for solving more general convex composite QSDP problems.*

8 Computational experiments

Consider the following general QSDP problem:

$$\min \ \Big\{ \tfrac{1}{2}\langle X,\, \mathcal{Q}X\rangle + \langle C,\, X\rangle \mid \mathcal{A}_E X = b_E,\ \mathcal{A}_I X \le b_I,\ X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+ \cap \mathcal{K} \Big\}, \tag{68}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_E : \mathcal{S}^n \to \Re^{m_E}$ and $\mathcal{A}_I : \mathcal{S}^n \to \Re^{m_I}$ are two linear maps. By adding slack variable x, we can equivalently rewrite (68) into the following standard form:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \dfrac{1}{2}\langle X,\, \mathcal{Q}X\rangle + \langle C,\, X\rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & \mathcal{A}_E X = b_E, \quad \mathcal{A}_I X + \mathcal{D}x = b_I, \quad X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+ \cap \mathcal{K}, \quad \mathcal{D}x \ge 0, \end{array} \tag{69}$$

where $\mathcal{D} : \Re^{m_I} \to \Re^{m_I}$ is a positive definite diagonal matrix which is introduced for the purpose of scaling the variable x. The dual of (69) is given by

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max & -\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}}(-Z) - \dfrac{1}{2}\langle W,\, \mathcal{Q}W\rangle + \langle b_E,\, y_E\rangle + \langle b_I,\, y_I\rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & Z - \mathcal{Q}W + S + \mathcal{A}_E^* y_E + \mathcal{A}_I^* y_I = C, \\ & \mathcal{D}^*(s + y_I) = 0, \quad S \in \mathcal{S}^n_+, \quad s \ge 0, \quad W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}). \end{array} \tag{70}$$

We can express (70) in a form which is similar to (**D**) as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \max & -\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}}(-Z) - \dfrac{1}{2}\langle W,\, \mathcal{Q}W\rangle + \langle b_E,\, y_E\rangle + \langle b_I,\, y_I\rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{I} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} Z - \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Q} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} W + \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{I} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{D}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S \\ s \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_E^* & \mathcal{A}_I^* \\ 0 & \mathcal{D}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y_E \\ y_I \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ & (S, s) \in \mathcal{S}^n_+ \times \Re^{m_I}_+, \quad W \in \mathrm{Range}(\mathcal{Q}). \end{array} \tag{71}$$

We can readily extend QSDPNAL to solve the above more general form of (71), and our implementation of QSDPNAL indeed can be used to solve (71).

In this section, we evaluate the performance our algorithm QSDPNAL for solving large-scale QSDP problems (68). Since QSDPNAL contains two phases, we also report the numerical results obtained by running QSDPNAL-Phase I (a first-order algorithm) alone for the purpose of demonstrating the power and importance of our two-phase framework for solving difficult QSDP problems. In our implementation of QSDPNAL, we employ a restarting strategy similar to the one in [33], i.e., when the progress of QSDPNAL-Phase II is not satisfactory, we will restart QSDPNAL-Phase I by using the most recently computed (Z, W, S, y, X, σ) as the initial point. Besides, we also adopt a dynamic tuning strategy to adjust the penalty parameter σ properly according to the progress of the algorithm. In fact, the aforementioned restarting strategy can also be viewed as a special realization of our dynamic tuning strategy as the penalty parameter σ is tuned more refinely in QSDPNAL-Phase I.

In our numerical experiments, we measure the accuracy of an approximate optimal solution (X, Z, W, S, y_E, y_I) for QSDP (68) and its dual by using the following relative KKT residual:

$$\eta_{\mathrm{qsdp}} = \max\{\eta_P, \eta_D, \eta_Z, \eta_{S_1}, \eta_{S_2}, \eta_{I_1}, \eta_{I_2}, \eta_{I_3}, \eta_W\}, \tag{72}$$

where

$$\eta_P = \frac{\|b_E - \mathcal{A}_E X\|}{1 + \|b_E\|}, \quad \eta_D = \frac{\|Z - \mathcal{Q}W + S + \mathcal{A}_E^* y_E + \mathcal{A}_I^* y_I - C\|}{1 + \|C\|}, \quad \eta_Z = \frac{\|X - \Pi_{\mathcal{K}}(X - Z)\|}{1 + \|X\| + \|Z\|},$$

$$\eta_{S_1} = \frac{|\langle S,\, X\rangle|}{1 + \|S\| + \|X\|}, \quad \eta_{S_2} = \frac{\|X - \Pi_{\mathcal{S}^n_+}(X)\|}{1 + \|X\|}, \quad \eta_{I_1} = \frac{\|\min(b_I - \mathcal{A}_I X, 0)\|}{1 + \|b_I\|}, \quad \eta_{I_2} = \frac{\|\max(y_I, 0)\|}{1 + \|y_I\|},$$

$$\eta_{I_3} = \frac{|\langle b_I - \mathcal{A}_I X,\, y_I\rangle|}{1 + \|y_I\| + \|b_I - \mathcal{A}_I X\|}, \quad \eta_W = \frac{\|\mathcal{Q}W - \mathcal{Q}X\|}{1 + \|\mathcal{Q}\|}.$$

Additionally, we compute the relative gap by

$$\eta_{\mathrm{gap}} = \frac{\mathrm{obj}_P - \mathrm{obj}_D}{1 + |\mathrm{obj}_P| + |\mathrm{obj}_D|},$$

where $\mathrm{obj}_P := \frac{1}{2}\langle X,\, \mathcal{Q}X\rangle + \langle C,\, X\rangle$ and $\mathrm{obj}_D := -\delta^*_{\mathcal{K}}(-Z) - \frac{1}{2}\langle W,\, \mathcal{Q}W\rangle + \langle b_E,\, y_E\rangle + \langle b_I,\, y_I\rangle$. We terminate both QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I when $\eta_{\mathrm{qsdp}} < 10^{-6}$ with the maximum number of iterations set at 50,000.

All our computational results are obtained from a workstation running on 64-bit Windows Operating System having 16 cores with 32 Intel Xeon E5-2650 processors at 2.60GHz and 64 GB memory. We have implemented QSDPNAL in MATLAB version 7.13.

8.1 Evaluation of QSDPNAL on nearest correlation matrix problems

Our first test example is the problem of finding the nearest correlation matrix (NCM) to a given matrix $G \in \mathcal{S}^n$:

$$\min \Big\{ \tfrac{1}{2}\|H \circ (X - G)\|_F^2 \mid \mathrm{diag}(X) \ = \ e, \ X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+ \cap \mathcal{K} \Big\}, \tag{73}$$

where $H \in \mathcal{S}^n$ is a nonnegative weight matrix, $e \in \Re^n$ is the vector of all ones, and $\mathcal{K} = \{W \in \mathcal{S}^n \mid L \le W \le U\}$ with $L, U \in \mathcal{S}^n$ being given matrices.

In our numerical experiments, we first take a matrix $\widehat{G}$, which is a correlation matrix generated from gene expression data from [12]. For testing purpose, we then perturb $\widehat{G}$ to

$$G := (1 - \alpha)\widehat{G} + \alpha E,$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a given parameter and E is a randomly generated symmetric matrix with entries uniformly distributed in $[-1, 1]$ except for its diagonal elements which are all set to 1. The weight matrix H is generated from a weight matrix H_0 used by a hedge fund company. The matrix H_0 is a 93×93 symmetric matrix with all positive entries. It has about 24% of the entries equal to 10^{-5} and the rest are distributed in the interval $[2, 1.28 \times 10^3]$. It has 28 eigenvalues in the interval $[-520, -0.04]$, 11 eigenvalues in the interval $[-5 \times 10^{-13}, 2 \times 10^{-13}]$, and the rest of 54 eigenvalues in the interval $[10^{-4}, 2 \times 10^4]$. The MATLAB code for generating the matrix H is given by

```
tmp = kron(ones(110,110),H0); H = tmp(1:n,1:n); H = (H'+H)/2.
```

The reason for using such a weight matrix is because the resulting problems generated are more challenging to solve as opposed to a randomly generated weight matrix. We also test four more instances, namely `PDidx2000`, `PDidx3000`, `PDidx5000` and `PDidx10000`, where the raw correlation matrix $\widehat{G}$ is generated from the probability of default (PD) data obtained from the RMI Credit Research Initiative[1], National University of Singapore. We consider two choices of $\mathcal{K}$, i.e., case (i): $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S}^n$ and case (ii): $\mathcal{K} = \{X \in \mathcal{S}^n \mid X_{ij} \ge -0.5, \ \forall\, i, j = 1, \ldots, n\}$.

In Table 1, we report the numerical results obtained by QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I in solving various instances of the H-weighted NCM problem (73). In the table, "it" denotes the number of outer iterations of QSDPNAL-Phase II and "itsGS" stands for the total number iterations used in QSDPNAL-Phase I. We can see from Table 1 that QSDPNAL is more efficient than the purely first-order algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase I, although the latter algorithm has already been demonstrated to be highly efficient for the H-weighted NCM problem [14]. In particular, for the instance `PDidx10000` where the matrix dimension $n = 10,000$ and $\mathcal{K}$ contains about 50 millions lower bound constraints, we are able to solve the problem in about 65 hours.

8.2 Evaluation of QSDPNAL on instances generated from BIQ problems

Based on the SDP relaxation of a binary integer quadratic (BIQ) problem considered in [26], we construct our second QSDP test example as following:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{(QSDP-BIQ)} & \min & \dfrac{1}{2}\langle X, \mathcal{Q}X\rangle + \dfrac{1}{2}\langle Q, Y\rangle + \langle c, x\rangle \\ & \text{s.t.} & \mathrm{diag}(Y) - x = 0, \quad \alpha = 1, \quad X = \begin{pmatrix} Y & x \\ x^T & \alpha \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}^n_+, \quad X \in \mathcal{K}, \\ & & -Y_{ij} + x_i \ge 0, \ -Y_{ij} + x_j \ge 0, \ Y_{ij} - x_i - x_j \ge -1, \ \forall\, i < j, \ j = 2, \ldots, n-1, \end{array} \tag{74}$$

[1] `http://www.rmicri.org/cms/cvi/overview/`.

Table 1: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on H-weighted NCM problems (dual of (73)) (accuracy = 10^{-6}). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S}^n$							
			iter.a	iter.b	η_{qsdp}	η_{gap}	time
problem	n	α	it | itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
Lymph	587	0.10	12 | 52	280	9.2-7 | 9.9-7	8.3-7 | -4.7-7	13 | 24
Lymph	587	0.05	11 | 38	205	9.5-7 | 9.9-7	7.5-7 | -4.1-7	10 | 17
ER	692	0.10	12 | 54	250	9.8-7 | 9.9-7	5.4-7 | -4.8-7	17 | 29
ER	692	0.05	12 | 43	218	7.3-7 | 9.7-7	2.5-7 | -4.4-7	14 | 25
Arabidopsis	834	0.10	12 | 56	285	8.5-7 | 9.9-7	2.9-7 | -5.3-7	28 | 49
Arabidopsis	834	0.05	12 | 44	230	8.0-7 | 9.5-7	-6.8-8 | -4.5-7	24 | 40
Leukemia	1255	0.10	12 | 62	340	8.4-7 | 9.9-7	3.1-7 | -5.4-7	1:11 | 2:24
Leukemia	1255	0.05	12 | 49	248	7.6-7 | 8.7-7	-1.3-7 | -4.5-7	1:03 | 1:51
hereditarybc	1869	0.10	13 | 76	393	6.4-7 | 9.9-7	-2.2-7 | -9.8-7	3:32 | 6:44
hereditarybc	1869	0.05	13 | 60	311	5.6-7 | 9.9-7	-4.7-7 | -1.0-6	3:15 | 5:24
PDidx2000	2000	0.10	10 | 131	590	7.1-7 | 9.9-7	5.7-6 | -8.5-7	9:50 | 11:43
PDidx2000	2000	0.05	10 | 139	626	8.1-7 | 9.9-7	3.3-6 | -9.5-7	10:37 | 12:41
PDidx3000	3000	0.10	10 | 144	1201	9.3-7 | 9.9-7	8.0-7 | 2.1-6	33:37 | 1:15:01
PDidx3000	3000	0.05	10 | 136	1263	7.7-7 | 9.7-7	2.5-7 | 2.0-6	38:03 | 1:19:27
PDidx5000	5000	0.10	11 | 189	1031	7.7-7 | 9.9-7	2.3-6 | 1.8-6	2:50:55 | 4:17:10
PDidx5000	5000	0.05	10 | 164	1699	9.7-7 | 9.9-7	1.6-6 | -1.3-7	2:34:15 | 6:18:29
PDidx10000	10000	0.10	13 | 200	2572	5.5-7 | 9.9-7	2.0-6 | -1.5-7	27:35:12 | 60:07:08
PDidx10000	10000	0.05	14 | 200	2532	6.9-7 | 9.9-7	1.9-6 | 1.4-7	29:02:46 | 59:34:13
$\mathcal{K} = \{X \in \mathcal{S}^n \mid X_{ij} \geq -0.5 \; \forall \, i,j = 1,\ldots,n\}$							
Lymph	587	0.10	6 | 132	264	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-1.3-7 | -4.7-7	16 | 28
Lymph	587	0.05	7 | 119	257	9.8-7 | 9.9-7	-3.4-7 | -4.2-7	14 | 25
ER	692	0.10	7 | 144	266	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-2.7-7 | -5.1-7	23 | 36
ER	692	0.05	7 | 108	217	8.2-7 | 9.9-7	-2.1-7 | -4.4-7	18 | 29
Arabidopsis	834	0.10	9 | 295	472	9.8-7 | 9.9-7	-5.9-7 | -6.0-7	1:09 | 1:35
Arabidopsis	834	0.05	7 | 262	442	8.6-7 | 9.9-7	-4.6-7 | -5.6-7	1:04 | 1:37
Leukemia	1255	0.10	9 | 171	333	9.7-7 | 9.9-7	-3.4-7 | -5.5-7	2:01 | 3:02
Leukemia	1255	0.05	7 | 188	253	8.9-7 | 9.9-7	-4.6-7 | -5.3-7	2:02 | 2:20
hereditarybc	1869	0.10	16 | 384	577	9.2-7 | 9.9-7	-7.8-7 | -8.9-7	10:07 | 12:33
hereditarybc	1869	0.05	12 | 379	472	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-8.5-7 | -8.6-7	9:36 | 10:21
PDidx2000	2000	0.10	14 | 691	718	9.9-7 | 9.8-7	-6.8-7 | -8.0-7	20:57 | 18:07
PDidx2000	2000	0.05	22 | 756	1333	9.6-7 | 5.8-7	-6.3-7 | -4.0-7	23:22 | 40:11
PDidx3000	3000	0.10	34 | 661	1648	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-6.9-7 | -9.2-7	1:23:43 | 2:11:47
PDidx3000	3000	0.05	41 | 728	1538	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-6.2-7 | -1.2-6	1:26:52 | 2:01:41
PDidx5000	5000	0.10	27 | 794	1154	9.3-7 | 9.9-7	-6.8-7 | 1.2-6	4:22:07 | 4:53:35
PDidx5000	5000	0.05	33 | 1081	1722	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-6.4-7 | -1.5-7	6:06:20 | 6:47:43
PDidx10000	10000	0.10	42 | 1289	2190	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-7.1-7 | 2.6-7	58:44:49 | 64:17:14
PDidx10000	10000	0.05	40 | 1519	3320	9.9-7 | 4.5-7	-6.6-7 | -1.7-8	65:13:19 | 94:53:10

where the convex set $\mathcal{K} = \{X \in \mathcal{S}^n \mid X \geq 0\}$. Here $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{S}^n \to \mathcal{S}^n$ is a self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}(X) = \frac{1}{2}(AXB + BXA) \tag{75}$$

with $A, B \in \mathcal{S}^n_+$ being matrices truncated from two different large correlation matrices (generated from Russell 1000 and Russell 2000 index, respectively) fetched from Yahoo finance by MATLAB. In our numerical experiments, the test data for Q and c are taken from Biq Mac Library maintained by Wiegele, which is available at `http://biqmac.uni-klu.ac.at/biqmaclib.html`.

Table 2 reports the numerical results for QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I in solving some large scale QSDP-BIQ problems. Note that from the numerical experiments conducted in [4], one can clearly conclude that QSDPNAL-Phase I (a variant of sGS-isPADMM) is the most efficient first-order algorithm for solving QSDP-BIQ problems with a large number of inequality constraints. Even so, it can be observed from Table 2 that QSDPNAL is still faster than QSDPNAL-Phase I on most of the problems tested.

Table 2: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on QSDP-BIQ problems (accuracy $= 10^{-6}$). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

		iter.a	iter.b	η_{qsdp}	η_{gap}	time
d	$m_E; m_I \mid n$	it|itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
be200.3.1	201 ; 59700 | 201	50 | 3432	4729	9.7-7 | 9.9-7	-3.6-7 | -7.2-7	2:54 | 3:54
be200.3.2	201 ; 59700 | 201	39 | 3745	13601	9.7-7 | 9.7-7	4.6-7 | -6.4-8	3:27 | 13:47
be200.3.3	201 ; 59700 | 201	102 | 5714	10601	9.6-7 | 8.2-7	-1.4-7 | -6.4-7	4:51 | 9:06
be200.3.4	201 ; 59700 | 201	33 | 2857	5197	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-1.9-7 | -4.2-7	2:22 | 5:08
be200.3.5	201 ; 59700 | 201	13 | 1897	3971	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	4.6-8 | -3.1-7	1:37 | 3:27
be250.1	251 ; 93375 | 251	72 | 6190	8627	9.7-7 | 9.9-7	-8.8-7 | -4.5-7	7:03 | 11:17
be250.2	251 ; 93375 | 251	104 | 8295	10525	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-7.0-7 | -7.1-7	10:10 | 13:57
be250.3	251 ; 93375 | 251	76 | 6496	8367	9.0-7 | 9.9-7	2.2-7 | -2.6-7	7:36 | 9:57
be250.4	251 ; 93375 | 251	63 | 4049	4602	9.7-7 | 9.9-7	-1.4-7 | -2.1-7	5:10 | 5:47
be250.5	251 ; 93375 | 251	58 | 5016	12458	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-1.4-7 | -2.0-7	6:16 | 16:28
bqp500-1	501 ; 374250 | 501	71 | 5844	11298	9.5-7 | 9.9-7	1.0-6 | -8.2-8	38:07 | 1:15:03
bqp500-2	501 ; 374250 | 501	33 | 3543	8374	8.4-7 | 9.9-7	1.0-7 | -8.8-8	23:30 | 57:50
bqp500-3	501 ; 374250 | 501	100 | 5766	6395	5.4-7 | 9.9-7	8.0-8 | -1.6-7	42:09 | 41:49
bqp500-4	501 ; 374250 | 501	82 | 7175	12489	5.1-7 | 9.9-7	9.7-7 | -1.1-7	48:56 | 1:27:14
bqp500-5	501 ; 374250 | 501	106 | 6778	10053	5.8-7 | 9.9-7	6.5-7 | -1.1-7	46:36 | 1:08:44
bqp500-6	501 ; 374250 | 501	84 | 6779	9742	6.5-7 | 9.9-7	6.3-7 | -1.3-7	48:35 | 1:01:34
bqp500-7	501 ; 374250 | 501	115 | 10184	9058	6.1-7 | 9.9-7	1.7-7 | -1.1-7	1:13:14 | 1:00:31
bqp500-8	501 ; 374250 | 501	70 | 6032	8148	7.9-7 | 9.9-7	6.9-7 | -1.0-7	42:19 | 52:23
bqp500-9	501 ; 374250 | 501	41 | 3773	9253	9.9-7 | 4.4-7	1.3-7 | -2.0-8	25:25 | 1:04:18
bqp500-10	501 ; 374250 | 501	128 | 8097	8465	8.9-7 | 9.9-7	7.1-8 | -9.1-8	56:18 | 57:14
gka1e	201 ; 59700 | 201	81 | 5433	8501	9.8-7 | 9.9-7	-5.1-8 | -3.5-7	4:22 | 7:15
gka2e	201 ; 59700 | 201	58 | 4182	6554	9.4-7 | 9.9-7	-7.1-8 | -2.1-7	3:40 | 4:57
gka3e	201 ; 59700 | 201	49 | 2437	4001	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	5.1-8 | -7.6-9	2:10 | 3:12
gka4e	201 ; 59700 | 201	44 | 3167	3500	6.9-7 | 9.9-7	-1.7-7 | -5.3-7	2:47 | 2:48
gka5e	201 ; 59700 | 201	37 | 2345	2902	5.6-7 | 8.9-7	-1.8-7 | -1.0-7	2:06 | 2:20

8.3 Evaluation of QSDPNAL on instances generated from QAP problems

Next we test the following QSDP problem motivated from the SDP relaxation of a quadratic assignment problem (QAP) considered in [18]. The SDP relaxation we used is adopted from [33] but we add a convex quadratic term in the objective to modify it into a QSDP problem. Specifically, given the data matrices $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{S}^l$ of a QAP problem, the problem we test is given by:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{(QSDP-QAP)} & \min & \frac{1}{2}\langle X,\, \mathcal{Q}X\rangle + \langle A_2 \otimes A_1,\, X\rangle \\ & \text{s.t.} & \sum_{i=1}^{l} X^{ii} = I,\ \langle I,\, X^{ij}\rangle = \delta_{ij} \quad \forall\, 1 \le i \le j \le l, \\ & & \langle E,\, X^{ij}\rangle = 1 \quad \forall\, 1 \le i \le j \le l, \quad X \in \mathcal{S}^n_+,\ X \in \mathcal{K}, \end{array} \tag{76}$$

where $n = l^2$, and $X^{ij} \in \Re^{l\times l}$ denotes the (i,j)-th block of X when it is partitioned uniformly into an $l \times l$ block matrix with each block having dimension $l \times l$. The convex set $\mathcal{K} = \{X \in \mathcal{S}^n \mid X \ge 0\}$, E is the matrix of ones, and $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$, and 0 otherwise. Note that here we use the same self-adjoint positive semidefinite linear operator $\mathcal{Q} : \mathcal{S}^n \to \mathcal{S}^n$ constructed in (75). In our numerical experiments, the test instances (A_1, A_2) are taken from the QAP Library [3].

In Table 3, we present the detail numerical results for QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I in solving some large scale QSDP-QAP problems. It is interesting to note that QSDPNAL can solve all the 74 difficult QSDP-QAP problems to an accuracy of 10^{-6} efficiently, while the purely first-order algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase I can only solve 2 of the problems to required accuracy. The superior numerical performance of QSDPNAL over QSDPNAL-Phase I clearly demonstrates the importance and necessity of our proposed two-phase algorithm for which second-order information is incorporated in the inexact proximal augmented Lagrangian algorithm in Phase II.

Table 3: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on QSDP-QAP problems (accuracy = 10^{-6}). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

		iter.a	iter.b	η_{qsdp}	η_{gap}	time
problem	m_E | n	it|itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
chr12a	232 ; 144	47 | 2051	50000	9.8-7 | 2.2-6	-8.0-6 | -2.5-5	54 | 6:34
chr12b	232 ; 144	51 | 2203	50000	7.7-7 | 3.7-6	-1.9-5 | -6.0-5	1:04 | 6:27
chr12c	232 ; 144	51 | 2264	50000	9.9-7 | 4.5-6	-2.0-5 | -6.1-5	59 | 6:27
chr15a	358 ; 225	55 | 2005	50000	9.4-7 | 5.7-6	-2.2-5 | **-1.0-4**	2:12 | 12:23
chr15b	358 ; 225	111 | 4602	50000	9.1-7 | 7.3-6	-1.3-5 | **-1.3-4**	5:06 | 12:31
chr15c	358 ; 225	64 | 3329	50000	9.9-7 | 6.8-6	-2.3-5 | -9.7-5	2:54 | 12:40
chr18a	511 ; 324	123 | 3303	50000	7.6-7 | 6.1-6	-1.8-5 | **-1.3-4**	8:02 | 22:26
chr18b	511 ; 324	86 | 3909	50000	9.3-7 | 8.4-6	-1.7-5 | **-1.6-4**	6:27 | 22:19
chr20a	628 ; 400	39 | 1751	4133	9.5-7 | 9.7-7	-3.3-5 | -3.4-5	5:19 | 5:46
chr20b	628 ; 400	72 | 4044	50000	9.3-7 | 9.1-6	-3.6-5 | **-1.4-4**	13:50 | 58:57
chr20c	628 ; 400	104 | 5211	50000	8.7-7 | 1.4-5	-3.9-5 | **-3.1-4**	20:23 | 55:41
chr22a	757 ; 484	70 | 2604	50000	8.6-7 | 5.0-6	-9.4-6 | -7.6-5	14:35 | 1:21:01
chr22b	757 ; 484	77 | 2809	50000	8.4-7 | 6.5-6	-1.6-5 | **-1.1-4**	18:10 | 1:19:48
els19	568 ; 361	49 | 2382	50000	9.8-7 | 1.2-6	6.7-6 | -8.6-6	10:12 | 1:04:08
esc16a	406 ; 256	104 | 6551	50000	9.4-7 | 8.3-6	-2.4-5 | **-1.3-4**	8:15 | 16:54
esc16b	406 ; 256	152 | 9257	50000	9.9-7 | 1.3-5	-3.9-5 | **-2.7-4**	12:39 | 16:56

Table 3: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on QSDP-QAP problems (accuracy = 10^{-6}). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

		iter.a	iter.b	η_{qsdp}	η_{gap}	time
problem	m_E | n	it|itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
esc16c	406 ; 256	166 | 10111	50000	9.9-7 | 1.2-5	-5.4-5 | **-3.5-4**	13:56 | 16:57
esc16d	406 ; 256	355 | 24662	50000	9.9-7 | 4.8-6	5.8-7 | -7.4-5	29:01 | 16:55
esc16e	406 ; 256	69 | 3600	50000	9.9-7 | 4.8-6	-1.9-5 | -5.6-5	4:40 | 16:35
esc16g	406 ; 256	83 | 4503	50000	8.1-7 | 7.2-6	-2.1-5 | -9.4-5	5:10 | 16:44
esc16h	406 ; 256	207 | 12342	50000	8.6-7 | 8.6-6	-8.8-6 | -8.7-5	15:45 | 16:21
esc16i	406 ; 256	72 | 2822	50000	9.8-7 | 4.6-6	-2.5-5 | -6.0-5	4:10 | 16:54
esc16j	406 ; 256	136 | 5315	50000	9.5-7 | 6.6-6	-1.5-5 | **-1.0-4**	7:17 | 16:24
esc32b	1582 ; 1024	114 | 6851	50000	9.6-7 | **1.5-4**	-2.3-5 | **-5.3-4**	2:54:09 | 7:42:25
esc32c	1582 ; 1024	164 | 5716	50000	8.3-7 | 7.2-6	-6.4-6 | -7.3-5	4:08:00 | 7:36:49
esc32d	1582 ; 1024	111 | 5411	50000	9.6-7 | 5.7-6	-7.8-6 | -6.4-5	3:03:24 | 7:19:17
had12	232 ; 144	57 | 2866	50000	9.9-7 | 3.3-6	-5.2-7 | -2.7-5	1:20 | 6:52
had14	313 ; 196	63 | 3327	50000	9.9-7 | 4.5-6	-5.2-6 | -2.8-5	2:22 | 11:21
had16	406 ; 256	108 | 4406	50000	9.4-7 | 9.9-6	-6.1-6 | -9.1-5	5:59 | 16:54
had18	511 ; 324	83 | 4407	50000	9.1-7 | 9.2-6	-1.5-5 | -7.3-5	8:08 | 24:46
had20	628 ; 400	145 | 6059	50000	9.9-7 | 1.0-5	-1.3-5 | **-1.0-4**	27:14 | 51:08
kra30a	1393 ; 900	107 | 4665	50000	9.5-7 | 6.5-6	-6.8-5 | **-1.7-4**	2:07:08 | 7:23:56
kra30b	1393 ; 900	116 | 5356	50000	9.9-7 | 6.5-6	-6.0-5 | **-1.7-4**	2:27:15 | 8:02:08
kra32	1582 ; 1024	124 | 7821	50000	9.9-7 | 7.4-6	-2.8-5 | **-1.6-4**	4:07:53 | 10:28:26
lipa30a	1393 ; 900	51 | 3203	50000	8.6-7 | 5.6-6	-2.0-6 | -3.1-5	53:38 | 6:52:34
lipa30b	1393 ; 900	181 | 6003	50000	9.2-7 | 7.0-6	-1.4-5 | **-1.9-4**	3:00:03 | 7:18:10
lipa40a	2458 ; 1600	51 | 2196	50000	8.0-7 | 4.2-6	-2.4-6 | -2.0-5	2:49:53 | 23:53:41
lipa40b	2458 ; 1600	115 | 4239	50000	9.9-7 | 3.9-6	-1.7-5 | -8.9-5	6:41:04 | 23:57:01
nug12	232 ; 144	87 | 4464	50000	9.9-7 | 5.4-6	-2.9-5 | **-1.1-4**	2:13 | 6:34
nug14	313 ; 196	83 | 4489	50000	9.0-7 | 6.9-6	-2.5-5 | **-1.1-4**	3:33 | 10:27
nug15	358 ; 225	87 | 5162	50000	9.9-7 | 1.1-5	-2.6-5 | **-1.7-4**	5:13 | 12:42
nug16a	406 ; 256	71 | 4498	50000	9.9-7 | 7.2-6	-2.6-5 | **-1.1-4**	4:38 | 18:17
nug16b	406 ; 256	131 | 4377	50000	9.6-7 | 1.2-5	-2.4-5 | **-2.0-4**	6:46 | 19:06
nug17	457 ; 289	101 | 5341	50000	9.7-7 | 1.3-5	-2.0-5 | **-1.8-4**	8:10 | 22:47
nug18	511 ; 324	87 | 5038	50000	9.0-7 | 6.1-6	-2.9-5 | -9.9-5	9:14 | 26:20
nug20	628 ; 400	93 | 4564	50000	9.9-7 | 8.6-6	-3.5-5 | **-1.3-4**	18:20 | 55:36
nug21	691 ; 441	98 | 4962	50000	9.9-7 | 6.8-6	-3.8-5 | **-1.1-4**	24:18 | 1:09:39
nug22	757 ; 484	136 | 6585	50000	9.9-7 | 8.3-6	-3.5-5 | **-1.3-4**	39:59 | 2:08:02
nug24	898 ; 576	83 | 4251	50000	9.7-7 | 6.5-6	-3.4-5 | **-1.1-4**	32:19 | 3:04:07
nug25	973 ; 625	106 | 5280	50000	9.9-7 | 6.9-6	-3.0-5 | **-1.1-4**	55:03 | 3:41:22
nug27	1132 ; 729	149 | 8621	50000	9.5-7 | 8.3-6	-2.6-5 | **-1.3-4**	2:06:09 | 4:59:06
nug28	1216 ; 784	102 | 5483	50000	9.9-7 | 7.8-6	-2.8-5 | **-1.1-4**	1:26:33 | 5:50:50
nug30	1393 ; 900	124 | 5864	50000	9.9-7 | 9.3-6	-2.5-5 | **-1.2-4**	2:36:38 | 7:40:43
rou12	232 ; 144	86 | 6255	50000	9.9-7 | 4.4-6	-2.3-5 | -9.3-5	2:59 | 6:36
rou15	358 ; 225	106 | 5988	50000	9.9-7 | 5.4-6	-2.7-5 | **-1.0-4**	5:37 | 13:02
rou20	628 ; 400	65 | 4244	50000	9.9-7 | 3.6-6	-2.5-5 | -6.1-5	13:06 | 1:00:07

Table 3: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on QSDP-QAP problems (accuracy = 10^{-6}). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

		iter.a	iter.b	$\eta_{\rm qsdp}$	$\eta_{\rm gap}$	time
problem	m_E | n	it|itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
scr12	232 ; 144	61 | 2391	50000	9.6-7 | 3.2-6	-1.2-5 | -4.0-5	1:09 | 6:57
scr15	358 ; 225	136 | 6429	50000	9.9-7 | 1.0-5	-1.7-5 | **-1.9-4**	6:59 | 12:45
scr20	628 ; 400	92 | 5586	50000	9.8-7 | 8.3-6	-3.3-5 | **-1.6-4**	19:50 | 1:01:19
tai12a	232 ; 144	136 | 7657	50000	9.9-7 | 8.9-6	-1.6-5 | **-1.3-4**	4:41 | 6:15
tai12b	232 ; 144	99 | 6719	50000	9.9-7 | 7.3-6	-3.7-5 | **-1.1-4**	3:33 | 6:19
tai15a	358 ; 225	85 | 4699	50000	9.9-7 | 3.0-6	-1.7-5 | -5.9-5	4:17 | 13:09
tai15b	358 ; 225	1 | 2307	2307	9.9-7 | 9.9-7	-2.9-6 | -2.9-6	1:01 | 1:01
tai17a	457 ; 289	95 | 5769	50000	9.4-7 | 3.8-6	-1.7-5 | -6.5-5	7:27 | 19:23
tai20a	628 ; 400	89 | 4821	50000	9.2-7 | 3.0-6	-2.2-5 | -5.4-5	16:42 | 1:00:55
tai25a	973 ; 625	25 | 3456	10084	9.5-7 | 9.9-7	1.4-6 | -1.5-5	17:36 | 47:55
tai25b	973 ; 625	155 | 5903	50000	9.1-7 | 1.4-5	-5.4-5 | **-2.6-4**	1:18:49 | 3:33:13
tai30a	1393 ; 900	94 | 4300	50000	9.4-7 | 2.8-6	-1.8-5 | -4.1-5	1:21:25 | 7:21:02
tai30b	1393 ; 900	393 | 12003	50000	9.1-7 | 1.2-5	-4.2-5 | **-2.1-4**	8:01:27 | 7:21:29
tai35a	1888 ; 1225	106 | 4979	50000	9.3-7 | 2.8-6	-1.1-5 | -3.5-5	3:27:40 | 15:04:40
tai35b	1888 ; 1225	193 | 7536	50000	8.8-7 | 1.2-5	-2.7-5 | **-1.9-4**	8:32:39 | 13:37:28
tai40a	2458 ; 1600	92 | 6560	50000	9.9-7 | 3.0-6	-1.0-5 | -3.4-5	6:57:28 | 23:07:21
tho30	1393 ; 900	119 | 5772	50000	9.8-7 | 8.0-6	-3.2-5 | **-1.3-4**	2:49:08 | 7:39:54
tho40	2458 ; 1600	118 | 3722	50000	9.4-7 | 7.4-6	-3.2-5 | **-1.0-4**	6:37:34 | 26:40:25

8.4 Evaluation of QSDPNAL on instances generated from sensor network localization problems

We also test the QSDP problems arising from the following sensor network localization problems with m anchors and l sensors:

$$\min_{u_1,\ldots,u_l\in\Re^d}\Big\{\tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{N}}\big(\|u_i-u_j\|^2-d_{ij}^2\big)^2 \;\mid\; \|u_i-a_k\|^2=d_{ik}^2,\ (i,k)\in\mathcal{M}\Big\}, \tag{77}$$

where the location of each anchor $a_k \in \Re^d$, $k = 1,\ldots,m$ is known, and the location of each sensor $u_i \in \Re^d$, $i = 1,\ldots,l$, is to be determined. The distance measures $\{d_{ij} \mid (i,j) \in \mathcal{N}\}$ and $\{d_{ik} \mid (i,k) \in \mathcal{M}\}$ are known pair-wise distances between sensor-sensor pairs and sensor-anchor pairs, respectively. Note that our model (77) is a variant of the model studied in [2]. Let $U = [u_1\ u_2\ \ldots u_l] \in \Re^{d\times l}$ be the position matrix that needs to be determined. We know that

$$\|u_i-u_j\|^2 = e_{ij}^T U^T U e_{ij}, \qquad \|u_i-a_k\|^2 = a_{ik}^T [U\ I_d]^T [U\ I_d] a_{ik},$$

where $e_{ij} = e_i - e_j$ and $a_{ik} = [e_i; -a_k]$. Here, e_k is the ith unit vector in $\Re^l$, and I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix. Let $g_{ik} = a_{ik}$ for $(i,k) \in \mathcal{M}$, $g_{ij} = [e_{ij}; \mathbf{0}_m]$ for $(i,j) \in \mathcal{N}$, and

$$V = U^T U, \qquad X = [V\ U^T; U\ I_d] \in \mathcal{S}^{(d+l)\times(d+l)}.$$

Following the same approach in [2], we can obtain the following QSDP relaxation model with regularization term for (77)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{N}}\left(g_{ij}^T X g_{ij} - d_{ij}^2\right)^2 - \lambda\langle I_{n+d} - aa^T,\, X\rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & g_{ik}^T X g_{ik} = d_{ik}^2,\ (i,k)\in\mathcal{M}, \quad X \succeq 0, \end{array} \tag{78}$$

where λ is a given positive regularzation parameter and $a = [\hat{e}; \hat{a}]$ with $\hat{e} = e/\sqrt{l+m}$ and $\hat{a} = \sum_{k=1}^m a_k/\sqrt{l+m}$. Here $e \in \Re^n$ is the vector of all ones.

The test examples are generated in the following way. We first randomly generate l points $\{\hat{x}_i \in \Re^d \mid i = 1,\ldots,l\}$ in $[-0.5, 0.5]^d$. Then, the edge set $\mathcal{N}$ is generated by considering only pairs of points that have distances less than a given positive number R, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N} = \{(i,j) \mid \|\hat{u}_i - \hat{u}_j\| \le R,\ 1 \le i < j \le l\}.$$

Given m anchors $\{a_k \in \Re^d \mid k = 1,\ldots,m\}$, the edge set $\mathcal{M}$ is similarly given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(i,k) \mid \|\hat{u}_i - a_k\| \le R,\ 1 \le i \le l,\ 1 \le k \le m\}.$$

We also assume that the distances d_{ij} are perturbed by random noises ε_{ij} as follows:

$$d_{ij} = \hat{d}_{ij}|1 + \tau\varepsilon_{ij}|, \quad (i,j) \in \mathcal{N},$$

where $\hat{d}_{ij}$ is the true distance between point i and j, ε_{ij} are assumed to be independent standard Normal random variables, τ is the noise parameter. For the numerical experiments, we generate 10 instances where the number of sensors l ranges from 250 to 1500 and the dimension d is set to be 2 or 3. W set the noise factor $\tau = 10\%$. The 4 anchors for the two dimensional case ($d = 2$) are placed at

$$(\pm 0.3, \pm 0.3),$$

and the positions of the anchors for the three dimensional case ($d = 3$) are given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1/3 & 2/3 & 2/3 & 1/3 \\ 1/3 & 2/3 & 1/3 & 2/3 \\ 1/3 & 1/3 & 2/3 & 2/3 \end{pmatrix} - 0.5.$$

Table 4: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on the sensor network localization problems (dual of (78)) (accuracy = 10^{-6}). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

		iter.a	iter.b	η_{qsdp}	η_{gap}	time
d	$m_E \mid n \mid R$	it|itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
2	452 | 252 | 0.50	12 | 652	24049	7.1-7 | 9.9-7	-9.0-7 | 6.8-7	1:00 | 6:10
2	548 | 502 | 0.36	12 | 1000	12057	7.6-7 | 9.9-7	-9.2-6 | -9.1-6	2:00 | 17:25
2	633 | 802 | 0.28	17 | 1000	27361	3.0-7 | 9.9-7	-2.4-6 | -9.9-6	7:00 | 1:59:16
2	684 | 1002 | 0.25	17 | 1000	50000	4.1-7 | 1.4-5	-2.6-6 | -3.0-7	13:20 | 6:16:37
2	781 | 1502 | 0.21	21 | 1000	50000	3.6-7 | **9.5-4**	-6.3-6 | **5.1-3**	30:08 | 13:47:39

Table 4: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on the sensor network localization problems (dual of (78)) (accuracy = 10^{-6}). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

		iter.a	iter.b	$\eta_{\rm qsdp}$	$\eta_{\rm gap}$	time
d	m_E | n | R	it|itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
2	774 | 2002 | 0.18	29 | 1000	50000	7.3-7 | **2.1-3**	-3.8-6 | **1.4-2**	59:53 | 23:20:28
3	395 | 253 | 0.49	11 | 408	1487	9.8-7 | 9.7-7	-1.4-6 | 1.3-7	08 | 18
3	503 | 503 | 0.39	14 | 877	7882	3.5-7 | 9.9-7	-1.1-6 | 2.5-6	1:46 | 7:18
3	512 | 803 | 0.33	15 | 1000	10579	7.7-7 | 9.9-7	-1.3-6 | 4.2-7	7:13 | 26:15
3	513 | 1003 | 0.31	16 | 1000	14025	2.5-7 | 9.9-7	-7.6-7 | 4.2-6	8:46 | 1:02:07
3	509 | 1503 | 0.27	19 | 1000	23328	8.6-7 | 9.9-7	-4.5-6 | 7.2-6	32:08 | 4:13:07
3	505 | 2003 | 0.24	19 | 1000	50000	9.5-7 | **3.3-4**	-1.4-5 | **-3.7-4**	49:28 | 16:45:24

Let $\mathcal{N}_i = \{p \mid (i,p) \in \mathcal{N}\}$ be the set of neighbors of the ith sensor. To further test our algorithm QSDPNAL, we also generate the following valid inequalities and add them to problem (77)

$$\|\hat{u}_i - \hat{u}_j\| \geq R, \, \forall \, (i,j) \in \widehat{\mathcal{N}},$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{N}} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \{(i,j) \mid j \in \mathcal{N}_p \backslash \mathcal{N}_i \text{ for some } p \in \mathcal{N}_i\}$. Then, we obtain the following QSDP relaxation model

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{N}} \left(g_{ij}^T X g_{ij} - d_{ij}^2\right)^2 - \lambda \langle I_{n+d} - aa^T, \, X \rangle \\ \text{s.t.} & g_{ik}^T X g_{ik} = d_{ik}^2, \, (i,k) \in \mathcal{M}, \\ & g_{ij}^T X g_{ij} \geq R^2, \, (i,j) \in \widehat{\mathcal{N}}, \quad X \succeq 0. \end{array} \tag{79}$$

In Table 4 and 5, we present the detail numerical results for QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I in solving some instances of problem (78) and (79), respectively. Clearly, QSDPNAL outperforms the purely first-order algorithm QSDPNAL-Phase I by a significant margin. This superior numerical performance of QSDPNAL over QSDPNAL-Phase I again demonstrates the importance and necessity of our proposed two-phase framework.

Table 5: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on the sensor network localization problems (dual of (79)) (accuracy = 10^{-6}). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

		iter.a	iter.b	$\eta_{\rm qsdp}$	$\eta_{\rm gap}$	time
d	$m_E; m_I$ | n | R	it|itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
2	452 ; 14402 | 252 | 0.50	15 | 585	50000	7.2-7 | 2.3-6	-8.0-7 | 1.7-7	2:17 | 26:51
2	548 ; 55849 | 502 | 0.36	16 | 1358	29565	8.1-7 | 9.9-7	-3.5-7 | -2.3-6	13:13 | 1:09:24
2	633 ; 118131 | 802 | 0.28	19 | 3188	36651	3.7-7 | 9.9-7	-2.7-6 | -5.4-6	1:04:52 | 3:43:51
2	684 ; 160157 | 1002 | 0.25	20 | 3506	50000	2.7-7 | 2.7-6	-7.4-7 | 2.2-6	2:34:28 | 8:30:28
2	724 ; 201375 | 1202 | 0.23	20 | 3805	50000	9.6-7 | 3.8-6	-1.6-6 | -2.8-6	5:12:20 | 11:57:56
3	395 ; 16412 | 253 | 0.49	12 | 468	3034	4.4-7 | 9.6-7	-4.2-7 | -1.8-7	52 | 1:29
3	503 ; 53512 | 503 | 0.39	13 | 978	11103	9.2-7 | 9.9-7	-2.2-6 | -4.1-7	7:35 | 20:36

Table 5: The performance of QSDPNAL and QSDPNAL-Phase I on the sensor network localization problems (dual of (79)) (accuracy = 10^{-6}). In the table, "a" stands for QSDPNAL and "b" stands for QSDPNAL-Phase I, respectively. The computation time is in the format of "hours:minutes:seconds".

		iter.a	iter.b	$\eta_{\rm qsdp}$	$\eta_{\rm gap}$	time
d	$m_E; m_I \mid n \mid R$	it|itsGS		a|b	a|b	a|b
3	512 ; 104071 | 803 | 0.33	17 | 1698	14211	7.0-7 | 9.9-7	-1.2-6 | 5.5-7	35:58 | 1:23:11
3	513 ; 139719 | 1003 | 0.31	21 | 2406	30878	5.1-7 | 9.9-7	7.6-8 | 1.2-7	1:26:40 | 4:10:34
3	526 ; 180236 | 1203 | 0.29	21 | 3447	18715	3.5-7 | 9.9-7	-5.4-8 | 1.1-5	1:49:46 | 3:45:01

9 Conclusions

In this paper, we have introduced an inexact sGS decomposition technique, based on which we design a two-phase proximal augmented Lagrangian method for solving large scale convex quadratic semidefinite programming problems. The global convergence and local convergent rate analyses of our algorithm QSDPNAL are based on the classic results of proximal point algorithms [23, 24], together with the recent advances in second order variational analysis of the convex composite quadratic semidefinite programming [6]. By devising "smart" numerical linear algebra, we have overcome various challenging numerical difficulties encountered in the implementation of QSDPNAL. Numerical experiments on various large scale QSDPs have demonstrated the efficiency and robustness of our proposed two-phase framework in obtaining accurate solutions. Specifically, for problems of moderate difficulty, our QSDPNAL-Phase I is already powerful enough and it is not necessary to execute QSDPNAL-Phase II. On the other hand, for more difficult problems, the purely first-order QSDPNAL-Phase I algorithm may stagnant because of slow local convergence. In contrast, for QSDPNAL (which has second order information wisely incorporated), it can still obtain highly accurate solutions efficiently.

References

[1] A. Y. Alfakih, A. Khandani, and H. Wolkowicz, *Solving Euclidean distance matrix completion problems via semidefinite programming*, Computational optimization and applications, 12 (1999), pp. 13–30.

[2] P. Biswas, T.C. Liang, K.-C. Toh, T.C. Wang, and Y. Ye, *Semidefinite programming approaches for sensor network localization with noisy distance measurements* , IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering, 3 (2006), pp. 360–371.

[3] R. E. Burkard, S. E. Karisch, and F. Rendl, *QAPLIB — a quadratic assignment problem library*, Journal of Global optimization, 10 (1997), pp. 391–403.

[4] L. Chen, D. F. Sun, and K.-C. Toh, *An efficient inexact symmetric Gauss-Seidel based majorized ADMM for high-dimensional convex composite conic programming*, arXiv:1506.00741, 2015.

[5] F. Clarke, *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1983.

[6] D. Han, D.F. Sun, and L. Zhang, *Linear rate convergence of the alternating direction method of multipliers for convex composite quadratic and semi-definite programming*, arXiv:1508.02134, 2015.

[7] N. J. Higham, *Computing the nearest correlation matrix — a problem from finance*, IMA journal of Numerical Analysis, 22 (2002), pp. 329–343.

[8] J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty, J.-J. Strodiot, and V. H. Nguyen, *Generalized hessian matrix and second-order optimality conditions for problems with $C^{1,1}$ data*, Applied mathematics and optimization, 11 (1984), pp. 43–56.

[9] K. Jiang, D. F. Sun, and K.-C. Toh, *An inexact accelerated proximal gradient method for large scale linearly constrained convex SDP*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 22 (2012), pp. 1042–1064.

[10] K. Jiang, D. F. Sun, and K.-C. Toh, *A partial proximal point algorithm for nuclear norm regularized matrix least squares problems*, Mathematical Programming Computation, 6 (2014), pp. 281-325.

[11] N. Krislock, J. Lang, J. Varah, D. K. Pai, and H.-P. Seidel, *Local compliance estimation via positive semidefinite constrained least squares*, IEEE Transactions on Robotics, 20 (2004), pp. 1007–1011.

[12] L. Li, and K.-C. Toh, *An inexact interior point method for l1-regularized sparse covariance selection*, Mathematical Programming Computation, 2 (2010), pp. 291–315.

[13] M. Li, D. F. Sun, and K.-C. Toh, *A majorized ADMM with indefinite proximal terms for linearly constrained convex composite optimization*, arXiv:1412.1911, 2014.

[14] X. D. Li, D. F. Sun, and K.-C. Toh, *A Schur complement based semi-proximal ADMM for convex quadratic conic programming and extensions*, Mathematical Programming, DOI: 10.1007/s10107-014-0850-5, December 2014.

[15] F. J. Luque, *Asymptotic convergence analysis of the proximal point algorithm*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 22 (1984), pp. 277–293.

[16] G. J. Minty, *Monotone (nonlinear) operators in Hilbert space*, Duke Mathematical Journal, 29 (1962), pp. 341–346.

[17] J.-S. Pang, D. F. Sun, and J. Sun, *Semismooth homeomorphisms and strong stability of semidefinite and Lorentz complementarity problems*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 28 (2003), pp. 39–63.

[18] J. Povh, and F. Rendl, *Copositive and semidefinite relaxations of the quadratic assignment problem*, Discrete Optimization, 6 (2009), pp. 231–241.

[19] H. Qi, *Local duality of nonlinear semidefinite programming*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 34 (2009), pp. 124–141.

[20] H. Qi, and D.F. Sun, *A quadratically convergent Newton method for computing the nearest correlation matrix*, SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications, 28 (2006), pp. 360–385.

[21] S. M. Robinson, *Some continuity properties of polyhedral multifunctions*, in Mathematical Programming at Oberwolfach, vol. 14 of Mathematical Programming Studies, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1981, pp. 206–214.

[22] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.

[23] R. T. Rockafellar, *Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 14 (1976), pp. 877–898.

[24] R. T. Rockafellar, *Augmented Lagrangians and applications of the proximal point algorithm in convex programming*, Mathematics of operations research, 1 (1976), pp. 97–116.

[25] D. F. Sun, and J. Sun, *Semismooth matrix-valued functions*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 27 (2002), pp. 150–169.

[26] D. F. Sun, K.-C. Toh, and L. Yang, *A convergent proximal alternating direction method of multipliers for conic programming with 4-block constranits*, SIAM journal on Optimization, 25 (2015), pp. 882–915.

[27] D. F. Sun, K.-C. Toh, and L. Yang, *An efficient inexact ABCD method for least squares semidefinite programming*, arXiv:1505.04278, 2015.

[28] J. Sun, *On monotropic piecewise quadratic programming*, PhD thesis, Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, 1986.

[29] J. Sun, and S. Zhang, *A modified alternating direction method for convex quadratically constrained quadratic semidefinite programs*, European Journal of Operational Research, 207 (2010), pp. 1210–1220.

[30] K.-C. Toh, R. Tütüncü, and M. Todd, *Inexact primal-dual path-following algorithms for a special class of convex quadratic SDP and related problems*, Pacific Journal of optimization, 3 (2007), pp. 135–164.

[31] K.-C. Toh, *An inexact primal–dual path following algorithm for convex quadratic SDP*, Mathematical programming, 112 (2008), pp. 221–254.

[32] S. Wright, and J. Nocedal, *Numerical optimization*, vol. 2, Springer New York, 1999.

[33] L. Yang, D. F. Sun and K.-C. Toh, *SDPNAL+: A majorized semismooth Newton-CG augmented Lagrangian method for semidefinite programming with nonnegative constraints*, Mathematical Programming Computation, 7 (2015), pp. 331–366.

[34] X. Zhao, *A semismooth Newton-CG augmented Lagrangian method for large scale linear and convex quadratic SDPs*, PhD thesis, Department of Mathematics, National University of Singapore, 2009.

[35] X. Zhao, D. F. Sun and K.-C. Toh, *A Newton-CG augmented Lagrangian method for semidefinite programming*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 20 (2010), pp. 1737–1765.